arXiv:1701.03395v2 [math.AP] 3 Mar 2017

HIGHER ORDER CONVERGENCE RATES IN THEORY OF HOMOGENIZATION II: OSCILLATORY INITIAL DATA

SUNGHAN KIM AND KI-AHM LEE

Abstract. We establish the higher order convergence rates in periodic homogenization of fully nonlinear uniformly parabolic Cauchy problems, accompanied with rapidly oscillating initial data. The higher order convergence rates are achieved by constructing the higher order initial layer correctors and the higher order interior correctors that describe the oscillatory behavior of the solutions to the given ε-problems. In order to construct these correctors, we establish a regularity theory in the slow variables, that is, the non-oscillatory physical variables, of solutions to either the spatially periodic Cauchy problems or the cell problems, based on the classical theory for viscosity solutions.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Main Result 2
1.2. Historical Background 3
1.3. Heuristic Discussion and Main Difficulties 3
1.4. Outline 5
2. Notation and Standing Assumptions 5
3. Regularity Theory in Slow Variables 6
3.1. Spatially Periodic Cauchy Problem 7
3.2. Cell Problem 14
4. Higher Order Convergence Rate 19
4.1. Initial Layer Corrector 19
4.2. Interior Corrector 26
4.3. Nonlinear Coupling Effect and the Bootstrap Argument 30
5. Further Observations 34
5.1. Non-oscillatory Initial Data and Higher Order Convergence Rate 34
5.2. Oscillatory Initial Data and Optimal Convergence Rate 36
References 39

S. Kim has been supported by National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korean government (NRF-2014-Fostering Core Leaders of the Future Basic Science Program). K.-A. Lee has been supported by NRF grant funded by the Korean government (MSIP) (No. NRF-2015R1A4A1041675). K.-A. Lee also holds a joint appointment with the Research Institute of Mathematics of Seoul National University.

1. Introduction

We are interested in higher order convergence rates in periodic homogenization of fully nonlinear uniformly parabolic Cauchy problems, accompanied with rapidly oscillating initial data. We conduct our analysis based on the theory of viscosity solutions. Readers may consult [CIL], [W1], [W2] and [W3] for standard existence and regularity theory of viscosity solutions.

1.1. **Main Result.**

The governing problem under our consideration is formulated as

$$\begin{cases} u_t^\varepsilon = \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} F\left(\varepsilon^2 D^2 u^\varepsilon, x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ u^\varepsilon(x,0) = g\left(x, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Our main result is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume F and g verify* (2.1) - (2.3) *and* (2.5) - (2.6) *respectively. Let u^ε be the viscosity solution to* (1.1) *for $\varepsilon > 0$. Then for each integer $d \geq 0$, there exist $\tilde{v}_{d,k} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, which is periodic in its third argument, and $\tilde{w}_{d,k} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, which is periodic in its third and fourth arguments, for each $k \geq 0$, such that one has*

$$\left| u^\varepsilon(x,t) - \sum_{d=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{m-2d} \varepsilon^{k+2d} \left(\tilde{v}_{d,k}\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \tilde{w}_{d,k}\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right)\right| \leq C_m \varepsilon^{m-1}, \tag{1.2}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $0 \leq t \leq T$, and, in particular,

$$\left| u^\varepsilon(x,t) - \sum_{d=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{m-2d} \varepsilon^{k+2d} \tilde{w}_{d,k}\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right| \leq C_m \varepsilon^{m-1}, \tag{1.3}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $c_m \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon| \leq t \leq T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $m \geq 0$, where $c_m > 0$ and $C_m > 0$ depend only on n, λ, Λ, α, m, T and K.

Let us make a few remarks regarding Theorem 1.1 as follows.

Remark 1.2. We shall call $\tilde{v}_{d,k}$ the (d,k)-th (or $(k+2d)$-th order) initial layer corrector. We will see later that the initial layer correctors decay exponentially fast as the fast temporal variable $s = \varepsilon^{-1}t$ approaches the infinity. This is why the time region associated with the estimate (1.3) begins with the layer $t \simeq \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon|$.

Remark 1.3. We shall call $\tilde{w}_{d,k}$ the (d,k)-th (or $(k+2d)$-th order) interior corrector. We will observe later that $\tilde{w}_{d,k}$ for $k \in \{0,1\}$ are constant in the fast variables $(y,s) = (\varepsilon^{-1}x, \varepsilon^{-2}t)$, for any $d \geq 0$. Thus, the left hand side of the estimate (1.3) begins with $u^\varepsilon(x,t) - \bar{u}_{0,0}(x,t) - \varepsilon \bar{u}_{0,1}(x,t) - \varepsilon^2 w_{0,2}(x,t,\varepsilon^{-1}x,\varepsilon^{-2}t) - \cdots$, which shows that u^ε becomes non-oscillatory in ε-scales, as soon as we stay away from the initial time layer; instead, $D^2 u^\varepsilon$ is rapidly oscillating in this region, which is why the interior correctors begin to oscillate in the fast variables from the second order.

1.2. **Historical Background.** Periodic homogenization of (1.1) (or (1.5), to be more exact) is rigorously justified in [AB] and [M1]; see also the references therein, and [Ish] for first order fully nonlinear equations as well as [ABM] for iterated homogenization. There is a wide range of existing literature on the rate of convergence in the homogenization process of (1.5), provided that the initial data is non-oscillatory; that is, g is independent on its second argument. Recent development can be found, for instance, in [JK], [M2] and [CM] using continuous dependence estimates, [Ich] based on a different approach, and [L], [LS] in stationary ergodic settings; see also the references therein for classical results in this regard.

Higher order convergence rate in the theory of homogenization has been studied in various settings. We refer to [CS], [KMP] for divergence type elliptic equations, [MS] for perforated domains with mixed boundary conditions, [CE] for Maxwell equations, [ABDW] for wave equations, [HO] for some numerical results, and also the references therein. Recently, the authors proved in [KL] higher order convergence rate for non-divergence type elliptic equations, based on the theory of viscosity solutions.

As far as we know, however, there has not yet been any result on (higher order) convergence rate in homogenization of (1.1). In this paper, we prove higher order convergence rate regarding (1.1). Based on this result, we also achieve higher order convergence rate (in Proposition 5.2) for uniformly parabolic equations with non-oscillatory initial data, that is,

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}^\varepsilon_t = F\left(D^2\bar{u}^\varepsilon, x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}^\varepsilon(x,0) = \bar{g}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

Moreover, we achieve optimal convergence rate (in Proposition 5.3) in homogenization of

$$\begin{cases} u^\varepsilon_t = F\left(D^2u^\varepsilon, x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ u^\varepsilon(x,0) = g\left(x, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

Although (1.1) and (1.5) coincide with each other when F is linear in the Hessian variable D^2u^ε, we observe a significant difference between them in the homogenization process, once F becomes nonlinear. The optimal convergence rate regarding the solution of (1.5) is established under some additional conditions on the behavior of F at infinity. We believe that these results will enrich our understanding especially on the highly oscillating behavior of a lower dimensional object.

1.3. **Heuristic Discussion and Main Difficulties.** Our analysis can be split into two parts. The first part is about initial layer correctors, and the second part is about interior correctors. Initial layer correctors will be given by solutions to certain spatially periodic Cauchy problems. Due to the periodicity, we will observe that the initial layer correctors converge to some values as time goes to infinity, and that the convergence will be exponentially fast. The limit values will turn out to be the effective initial data.

The exponential decay estimate of the difference between initial layer correctors and the corresponding effective initial data is deduced from the Harnack inequality for viscosity solutions. Such an decay estimate can be considered classical if one thinks of heat equations (or divergence type uniformly parabolic equations) on

spatially periodic domain. One may also find some variations in this regard in several other places. For example, see [JK], [CM] for continuous dependence estimates, and [AA] for elliptic boundary correctors.

However, what is new in this paper is that we achieve exponential decay estimates for higher order derivatives of initial layer correctors in non-oscillatory variables. It also provides higher order regularity of the effective initial data. Moreover, such an exponential decay estimate will be used significantly when we achieve higher order convergence rate of the associated homogenization process.

On the other hand, the analysis on interior correctors mainly follows our previous work [KL]. Indeed, we find the argument here almost identical to that of the prescribed paper. Nonetheless, we will provide the details for readers' convenience.

The main difficulties in achieving higher order convergence rate are due to the nonlinear structure of (1.1) and (1.4). If our operator is linear (that is, $F(P, x, t, y, s) = \operatorname{tr}(A(x, t, y, s)P)$), the construction of the higher order correctors at the current step is independent of that at the previous step. However, when the operator is fully nonlinear, the operator seems to "record" all the oscillatory behavior of the correctors that are constructed in the previous step. Such a phenomenon makes the analysis much more complicated as we move further. For instance, see the problem (4.55) that arises from the d-th step.

An interesting observation in this direction is that the nonlinearity of F produces the coupling effect near the initial time layer (that is, $0 < t \ll \varepsilon^2|\log\varepsilon|$) between the oscillation due to the initial data and the oscillation "recorded" from the previous step. We observe that this nonlinear coupling effect does not affect the construction of the higher order interior correctors in the current step, since it dissipates exponentially fast and becomes negligible, once we stay away from the initial time layer (that is, when $t \gtrsim \varepsilon^2|\log\varepsilon|$). However, it does not mean that the nonlinear coupling effect in the current step can be disregarded afterwards as well. We realize that the nonlinear coupling effect becomes effective and needs to be taken care of in the next step of the construction of the higher order initial layer correctors. As far as we know, our observation of such a nonlinear coupling effect in the construction of the higher order correctors has been unprecedented in the theory of homogenization.

Let us make the final remark on homogenization of (1.5). The key difference in the homogenization process between (1.1) and (1.5) is that the initial layer corrector of the latter problem may not be differentiable in the slow variables in general, even though the operator F is smooth and concave. In contrast, the initial corrector of (1.1) is as smooth as is the operator F. The main reason for such a distinction is, roughly speaking, that the operator of (1.1) oscillates "in coordination with" the oscillation of the initial data, which "stabilize" the influence of the fully nonlinearity of the operator near the initial time layer to a controllable level. This ensures the base-case initial layer corrector (and the base-case effective initial data) to be smooth enough in the slow variables to induce higher order ones. However, the operator of (1.5) makes "too much" impact on the oscillation of the solution near the initial layer and, as a result, defects the regularity of the base-case initial layer corrector in a substantial way.

We observe that the higher order convergence rate in the framework of (1.5) is a highly sophisticated matter that requires a thorough analysis on the limiting

behavior of the sequence $\{\varepsilon^2 F(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}P, x, t, y, s)\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This part will be the subject of our forthcoming paper.

Instead, we prove the optimal convergence rate for certain uniformly parabolic operators F and certain initial data g. We observe that the convergence rate is determined by that of the sequence $\{\varepsilon^2 F(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}P, x, t, y, s)\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ to its limit operator (if any). Moreover, we find out that either the structure of the limit operator or that of the initial data determines affects the rate of the homogenization process.

1.4. **Outline.** This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the notations and the standing assumptions that will be used throughout this paper, unless stated otherwise. In Section 3, we establish the regularity theory in the slow variables and, in Section 4, we prove our main result, Theorem 1.1. Section 5 is devoted to proving some additional results, namely the higher order convergence rate in homogenization of (1.4), and the optimal convergence rate in homogenization of (1.5).

2. Notation and Standing Assumptions

Let $n \geq 1$ be the spatial dimension and $T > 0$ be the terminal time. We will call x (resp., t, y, and s) the slow spatial (resp., slow temporal, fast spatial, and fast temporal) variable.

By $\mathbb{S}^n$ we denote the space of all real symmetric matrices of order n, endowed with (L^2, L^2)-norm; that is, $\|P\| = (\sum_{i,j=1}^n p_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$ for any $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$. By $E_{ij} = (e_{kl}^{ij})$ we will denote the (i, j)-th standard basis matrix for $\mathbb{S}^n$ that is $e_{kl}^{ij} = 2^{-1}(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \delta_{il}\delta_{jk})$ with δ being the Kronecker delta. By $\mathrm{tr}(P)$ we denote the trace of P.

Let F be a smooth functional on $\mathbb{S}^n$. By $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p_{ij}}(P)$ we denote the derivative of F in direction E_{ij} at P. By $D_p^k F$ we denote the k-th order derivative of F on $\mathbb{S}^n$ such that

$$D_p^k F(P) = \left(\frac{\partial^k F}{\partial p_{i_1 j_1} \cdots \partial p_{i_l j_l} \cdots \partial p_{i_k j_k}}(P)\right) = \left(\frac{\partial^k F}{\partial p_{i_1 j_1} \cdots \partial p_{j_l i_l} \cdots \partial p_{i_k j_k}}(P)\right).$$

For notational convenience, we also understand $D_p^k F$ in the sense of Fréchet derivatives. That is, for each $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$, we consider $D_p^k F(P)$ as the (symmetric) multilinear map from $(\mathbb{S}^n)^k$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$D_p^k F(P)(Q_1, \cdots, Q_k) = \frac{\partial^k F}{\partial p_{i_1 j_1} \cdots \partial p_{i_k j_k}}(P) q_{i_1 j_1}^1 \cdots q_{i_k j_k}^k,$$

for any $Q_l = (q_{ij}^l) \in \mathbb{S}^n$ with $1 \leq l \leq k$; here and thereafter we use the summation convention for repeated indices. In particular, we have

$$D_p F(P)(Q) = \mathrm{tr}(D_p F(P) Q).$$

We will use the parabolic terminologies, such as $|(x, t)| = (|x|^2 + |t|)^{1/2}$. For more details, we refer to [W1]. See [CIL] for the classical existence theory, the comparison principle and the stability theory of viscosity solutions. Also see [W1], [W2] and [W3] for the basic regularity theory for viscosity solutions, such as the Harnack inequality, and interior and boundary $C^{k,\alpha}$-estimates.

Now let us make the standing assumptions throughout this paper. Assume $F : \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly elliptic and concave on $\mathbb{S}^n$. That is,

there are constants $0 < \lambda \le \Lambda$ such that

$$\lambda \|Q\| \le F(P+Q,x,t,y,s) - F(P,x,t,y,s) \le \Lambda \|Q\| \quad (Q \in \mathbb{S}^n, Q \ge 0), \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\rho F(P,x,t,y,s) + (1-\rho)F(Q,x,t,y,s) \le F(\rho P + (1-\rho)Q,x,t,y,s) \quad (Q \in \mathbb{S}^n, \rho \in [0,1]),$$

for all $(P,x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. We also assume that F is periodic in its last two arguments:

$$F(P,x,t,y+k,s+l) = F(P,x,t,y,s) \quad (k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, l \in \mathbb{Z}), \tag{2.2}$$

for all $(P,x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Suppose further that $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, and there is $K > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{|\kappa|+|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left\| D_p^\kappa D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu F(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \le K \|P\|^{(1-|\kappa|)_+}, \tag{2.3}$$

for any $(P,x,t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, for any integer $m \ge 0$. Let us remark that (2.3) implies

$$F(0,x,t,y,s) = 0, \tag{2.4}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. In other words, there is no source term in (1.1) and (1.5).

On the other hand, let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be periodic in its second argument; that is,

$$g(x,y+k) = g(x,y) \quad (k \in \mathbb{Z}^n), \tag{2.5}$$

for any $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Also suppose that $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and

$$\sum_{|\mu|=m} \left\| D_x^\mu g(x,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le K, \tag{2.6}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and each integer $m \ge 0$.

3. Regularity Theory in Slow Variables

Suppose that we have a family of uniformly parabolic equations that are defined in the fast variables (y,s) and are parameterized by the slow variables (x,t). Then we obtain a function $v = v(x,t,y,s)$ such that $(y,s) \mapsto v(x,t,y,s)$ solves the equation corresponding to (x,t). The regularity of $(y,s) \mapsto v(x,t,y,s)$ can be deduced from existing literature concerning uniformly parabolic equations. In this section, we study the regularity of $(x,t) \mapsto v(x,t,y,s)$, based on existing results on the regularity of $(y,s) \mapsto v(x,t,y,s)$.

This section is mainly concerned with the following two types of uniformly parabolic equations, namely the spatially periodic Cauchy problems and the cell problems. The former will be the equations for initial layer correctors, whereas the latter are will be those for interior correctors.

3.1. **Spatially Periodic Cauchy Problem.** Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be periodic in its third argument, that is,

$$f(x,t,y+k,s) = f(x,t,y,s) \quad (k \in \mathbb{Z}^n), \tag{3.1}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$. Assume that $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$ and there is $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu f(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))} + e^{\beta s} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu f(x,t,\cdot,s) \right\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right] \le K, \tag{3.2}$$

for all $(x,t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times [0,\infty)$ and each integer $m \ge 0$, with $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $K > 0$ being the same constants that are used in (2.3).

For each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, let us consider the following spatially periodic and uniformly parabolic Cauchy problem,

$$\begin{cases} v_s = F(D_y^2 v, x, t, y, s) + f(x,t,y,s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ v(x,t,y,0) = g(x,y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

By the standard existence theory [CIL], we know that there exists a unique viscosity solution $v(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ to (3.3). Due to the periodicity of F, f and g, we deduce that v is also periodic in y, that is,

$$v(x,t,y+k,s) = v(x,t,y,s) \quad (k \in \mathbb{Z}^n), \tag{3.4}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$.

We shall begin with an easy observation that the spatial oscillation of $v(x,t,y,s)$ in y decays exponentially fast as $s \to \infty$. The exponential rate will turn out to be independent of (x,t).

Lemma 3.1. *For each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, there exists a unique $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$e^{\beta_0 s} |v(x,t,y,s) - \gamma| \le C, \tag{3.5}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$, where $0 < \beta_0 < \beta$ depends only on n, λ, Λ and β, and $C > 0$ depend only on n, λ, Λ, β, β_0 and K.

Proof. Since (x,t) will be fixed throughout the proof, let us write $v = v(y,s)$, $F = F(M,y,s)$, $f = f(y,s)$ and $g = g(y)$ for notational convenience. By $S(s)$, $I(s)$ and $O(s)$ let us denote $\sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(\cdot,s)$, $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(\cdot,s)$ and respectively $\operatorname{osc}_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(\cdot,s)$. Also write $Y = (0,1)^n$ and $2Y = (0,2)^n$. By the spatial periodicity (3.4) of v, we have $S(s) = \sup_{2Y} v(\cdot,s) = \sup_Y v(\cdot,s)$, and similar identities for $I(s)$ and $O(s)$ as well.

Fix $s_0 \ge 0$. Then

$$\partial_s \left(S(s_0) + \frac{K}{\beta}(e^{-\beta s_0} - e^{-\beta s}) \right) = K e^{-\beta s} \ge f(y,s),$$

for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $s \ge s_0$, due to (3.2). Since we have (2.4), we deduce that $S(s_0) + \frac{K}{\beta}(e^{-\beta s_0} - e^{-\beta s})$ is a supersolution to (3.3) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times [s_0,\infty)$. Similarly, one can observe that $I(s_0) - \frac{K}{\beta}(e^{-\beta s_0} - e^{-\beta s})$ is a subsolution to (3.3) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times [s_0,\infty)$. Thus, by the comparison principle [CIL] for viscosity solutions, we deduce that

$$I(s_0) - \frac{K}{\beta}(e^{-\beta s_0} - e^{-\beta s}) \le v(y,s) \le S(s_0) + \frac{K}{\beta}(e^{-\beta s_0} - e^{-\beta s}), \tag{3.6}$$

for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $s \ge s_0$.

Now for each nonnegative integer k, let us define

$$v_k(y,s) = v(y,s+k) - I(k) + \frac{K}{\beta}e^{-\beta k} \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}^n, s \geq 0).$$

From (3.6) with s and s_0 replaced by $s+k$ and k respectively, we deduce that

$$v_k(y,s) \geq 0 \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}^n, s \geq 0).$$

On the other hand, we see that v_k is a (spatially periodic) viscosity solution to

$$\partial_s v_k = F(D_y^2 v_k, y, s+k) + f(y, s+k) \quad \text{in } 2Y \times (0,1).$$

Therefore, we may apply the Harnack inequality in $\bar{Y} \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and deduce from the spatial periodicity of v_k that

$$S\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) - I(k) + \frac{K}{\beta}e^{-\beta k} \leq c_1\left(I(k+1) - I(k) + \frac{K}{\beta}e^{-\beta k}\right),$$

where c_1 depends only on n, λ and Λ. Utilizing (3.6) with $s_0 = k + \frac{1}{2}$ and $s = k+1$, we obtain that $S(k+1) \leq S(k+\frac{1}{2}) + \frac{K}{\beta}e^{-\beta k}$. Combining these two inequalities, we arrive at

$$S(k+1) - I(k) \leq c_1\left(I(k+1) - I(k) + \frac{K}{\beta}e^{-\beta k}\right). \tag{3.7}$$

Now we define

$$w_k(y,s) = S(k) + \frac{K}{\beta}e^{-\beta k} - v(y, s+k) \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}^n, s \geq 0).$$

Then by (3.6) and (3.3), w_k is a spatially periodic nonnegative viscosity solution to

$$\partial_s w_k = -F(-D_y^2 w_k, y, s+k) - f(y, s+k) \quad \text{in } 2Y \times (0,1).$$

Notice that the operator $-F(-M, y, s)$ satisfies the same ellipticity condition (2.1). Hence, we may invoke a similar argument as above and prove that

$$S(k) - I(k+1) \leq c_1\left(S(k) - S(k+1) + \frac{K}{\beta}e^{-\beta k}\right). \tag{3.8}$$

Notice that the constant c_1 here is the same as that in (3.7).

By (3.7) and (3.8), we have

$$O(k+1) \leq \frac{c_1 - 1}{c_1 + 1}O(k) + \frac{2c_1 K}{(c_1+1)\nu}e^{-\beta k}. \tag{3.9}$$

Iterating (3.9) with respect to k and using $O(0) = \operatorname{osc}_{\mathbb{R}^n} g \leq 2K$, we arrive at

$$e^{\beta_0 s}O(s) \leq c_2 K \quad \text{with } 0 < \beta_0 < \min\left(\beta, \log\frac{c_1+1}{c_1-1}\right), \tag{3.10}$$

where $c_2 > 0$ is another constant depending only on n, λ, Λ, β and β_0.

The estimate (3.10) implies that $O(s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$. On the other hand, we know from (3.6) that both $S(s)$ and $I(s)$ converge as $s \to \infty$. Combining these two observations, we deduce that $S(s)$ and $I(s)$ converge to the same limit, which we shall denote by γ. Then (3.5) follows immediately from (3.10). □

Remark 3.2. The proof of Lemma 3.1 does not involve the periodicity of F in s.

By Lemma 3.1, we are able to define $\bar{v} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\bar{v}(x,t) = \lim_{s\to\infty} v(x,t,0,s). \tag{3.11}$$

The limit value in the right hand side of (3.11) is precisely the unique constant γ in the statement of Lemma 3.1. With $\bar{v}$ at hand, (3.5) reads

$$e^{\beta_0 s}|v(x,t,y,s) - \bar{v}(x,t)| \le C, \tag{3.12}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$.

One may notice that the proof of Lemma 3.1 does not involve the assumptions on the concavity of F in P, the C^α regularity of F and f in (y,s) and the $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularity of g in y. Assuming these conditions additionally, we are allowed to use the interior and boundary $C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}$ estimates (the so-called Schauder theory) for viscosity solutions (with some $0 < \bar{\alpha} \le \alpha$). As a result, we improve the estimate (3.12) in terms of $C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}$ norm.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists $0 < \bar{\alpha} < \alpha$, depending only on n, λ, Λ and α, such that $\bar{v} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ and $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$ with*

$$\|v(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_0 s}\,\|v(x,t,\cdot,s) - \bar{v}(x,t)\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C, \tag{3.13}$$

for any $(x,t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times [0,\infty)$, where $C > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, β, β_0 and K.

Proof. Let us fix $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and simply write $F(P,y,s)$, $f(y,s)$, $g(y)$, $v(y,s)$, and γ by $F(P,x,t,y,s)$, $f(x,t,y,s)$, $g(x,y)$, $v(x,t,y,s)$ and, respectively, $\bar{v}(x,t)$. Let us denote by Y and $2Y$ the cubes $(0,1)^n$ and $(0,2)^n$.

In view of (3.3), the function $\tilde{v}(y,s) = v(y,s) - \gamma$ is a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_s = F(D_y^2\tilde{v}, y, s) + f(y,s) & \text{in } 2Y \times (0,\infty), \\ \tilde{v}(y,0) = g(y) - \gamma & \text{on } 2Y. \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

Since F is uniformly elliptic and concave in P, and since F and f are C^α while g is $C^{2,\alpha}$ in (y,s), we may apply the boundary $C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}$ estimate [W2] to (3.14) for some $0 < \bar{\alpha} \le \alpha$, depending only on n, λ, Λ and α. This yields that $\tilde{v} \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{Y} \times [0,s_0])$ with

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{Y}\times[0,s_0])} \le c_1 \left(\|\tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty(2Y\times[0,1))} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(2Y\times[0,1))} + \|g\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(2Y)} \right),$$

where $0 < s_0 \le \frac{1}{2}$ and $c_1 > 0$ depend only on n, λ, Λ, α and K. Utilizing (3.5), (3.2) and (2.6) (with $m = 0$), we derive that

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(Y\times[0,s_0])} \le c_2, \tag{3.15}$$

where $c_2 > 0$ is determined only by n, λ, Λ, α, β, β_0 and K.

Now let us fix a nonnegative integer k and define

$$\tilde{v}_k(y,s) = \tilde{v}(y, s+k) \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}^n, s \ge 0).$$

Then from (3.14), we know that $\tilde{v}_k$ solves

$$\partial_s \tilde{v}_k = F(D_y^2\tilde{v}_k, y, s+k) + f(y, s+k) \quad \text{in } 2Y \times (0,2).$$

Hence, it follows from the interior $C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}$ estimate (with $\bar{\alpha}$ being the same as that in (3.15)) that $\tilde{v}_k \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{Y} \times [s_0, s_0+1])$ with

$$\|\tilde{v}_k\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{Y}\times[s_0,s_0+1])} \le c_3 \left(\|\tilde{v}_k\|_{L^\infty(2Y\times(0,2))} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(2Y\times(0,2))} \right),$$

where $c_3 > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, α and K. Utilizing (3.5) and (3.2) (with $m = 0$), we deduce that

$$\|\tilde{v}_k\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{Y}\times[s_0,s_0+1])} \le c_4 e^{-\beta_0 k}, \tag{3.16}$$

where $c_4 > 0$ is determined only by n, λ, Λ, α, β, β_0 and K.

Iterating (3.16) with respect to k and utilizing (3.15) for the initial case of this iteration argument, we arrive at (3.13). □

Let us remark that Lemma 3.3 yields the compactness (in (y,s)) of the sequences $\{v(x_i,t_i,y,s)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\tilde{v}(x_i,t_i,y,s)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ when $(x_i,t_i) \to (x,t)$. By the stability theory [CIL] of viscosity solutions, we obtain that v and $\tilde{v}$ are continuous in (x,t), stated as below. Let us also point out that the following lemma is a version of continuous dependence estimates, and we refer to [JK], [CM] and other literature for more discussions in this regard.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the Hölder exponent chosen in Lemma 3.3. Then $\bar{v} \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ and $v \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we will fix $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and continue with using the simplified notation for F, f, g, v, γ and $\tilde{v}$. Let us take any sequence $(x_i,t_i) \to (x,t)$ as $i \to \infty$. For notational convenience, let us write $F_i(P,y,s) = F(P,x_i,t_i,y,s)$, $f_i(y,s) = f(x_i,t_i,y,s)$, $g_i(y) = g(x_i,y)$, $v_i(y,s) = v(x_i,t_i,y,s)$, $\gamma_i = \bar{v}(x_i,t_i)$ and $\tilde{v}_i(y,s) = v_i(y,s) - \gamma_i$. By C we denote a positive constant that depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, β, β_0 and K, and will let it vary from one line to another.

We prove $v_i \to v$ first. By (3.13) we have

$$\|v_i\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty))} \le C,$$

for any $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. Hence, we know from the Arzela-Ascoli theorem that for any subsequence $\{w_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, there exist a further subsequence $\{w_{j_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and a certain function $w \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ such that $w_{j_k} \to w$ in $C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ as $k \to \infty$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. One may notice that w_{j_k} solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s w_{j_k} = F_{j_k}(D_y^2 w_{j_k}, y, s) + f_{j_k}(y,s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ w_{j_k}(y,0) = g_{j_k}(y) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

in the viscosity sense. Due to the regularity assumptions (2.3), (2.6) and (3.2) on F, g and respectively f, we know that $F_i \to F$ uniformly on $\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$, $g_i \to g$ uniformly on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $f_i \to f$ uniformly on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$, as $i \to \infty$. Hence, letting $k \to \infty$, we observe from the stability theory [CIL] that the limit function w also solves

$$\begin{cases} w_s = F(D_y^2 w, y, s) + f(y,s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ w(y,0) = g(y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

in the viscosity sense. However, the above equation is identical with the equation (3.3). Since v is the unique solution to (3.3), we deduce that $w = v$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$.

What we have proved so far is that for any subsequence of $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, there exists a further subsequence which converges to v. Thus, $v_i \to v$ as $i \to \infty$ in $C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$.

Now we are left with showing that $\gamma_i \to \gamma$. Due to (3.13), we have

$$e^{\beta_0 s} \|\tilde{v}_i(\cdot, s)\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C, \tag{3.17}$$

for any $s \ge 0$, uniformly for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. Since $\tilde{v}_i(y, s) = v_i(y, s) - \gamma_i$ and $\tilde{v}(y, s) = v(y, s) - \gamma$, we deduce from (3.17) and (3.13) that

$$|\gamma_i - \gamma| \le 2Ce^{-\beta_0 s} + |v_i(0, s) - v(0, s)|.$$

Given any $\delta > 0$, we fix a sufficiently large s_0 such that $4Ce^{-\beta_0 s_0} \le \delta$, and correspondingly choose i_0 such that $2|v_i(0, s_0) - v(0, s_0)| \le \delta$ for all $i \ge i_0$. Then we have $|\gamma_i - \gamma| \le \delta$ for all $i \ge i_0$, proving that $\gamma_i \to \gamma$ as $i \to \infty$. Thus, the proof is finished. □

By Lemma 3.4, we are ready to prove the differentiability of v and h in the slow variables (x, t), and an exponential decay estimate for the derivatives of $v - h$. Here we use Lemma 3.4 to obtain compactness (in (y, s)) of the difference quotients (in (x, t)) of v. Arguing similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we deduce that the difference quotients converge to a single limit, proving the differentiability of v.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the Hölder exponent chosen in Lemma 3.3. Then there exist $D_{x_k}\bar{v}(x, t)$ and $D_{x_k}v(x, t, \cdot, \cdot) \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty))$, for any $1 \le k \le n$, such that*

$$\left\| D_{x_k} v(x, t, \cdot, \cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_1 s} \left\| D_{x_k}(v(x, t, \cdot, s) - \bar{v}(x, t)) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C,$$

for any $(x, t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$, where $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ and β_0, and $C > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, β, β_0, β_1 and K. Moreover, we have $\bar{v} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T])$ and $v \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$.

Remark 3.6. According to the parabolic terminology, C^1 regularity in (x, t) only involves derivatives in x. For more details, see Section 2.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Throughout this proof, let us write by C a positive constant depending only on n, λ, Λ, α, β and K, and allow it to vary from one line to another. Fix $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$ and $1 \le k \le n$. We shall omit the dependence on t for notational convenience. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned}
A_\sigma(y, s) &= \int_0^1 D_p F(\rho D_y^2 v(x + \sigma e_k, y, s) + (1 - \rho) D_y^2 v(x, y, s), x, y, s) d\rho, \\
\Psi_\sigma(y, s) &= \frac{F(D_y^2 v(x + \sigma e_k, y, s), x + \sigma e_k, y, s) - F(D_y^2 v(x + \sigma e_k, y, s), x, y, s)}{\sigma} \\
&\quad + \frac{f(x + \sigma e_k, y, s) - f(x, y, s)}{\sigma}, \\
G_\sigma(y) &= \frac{g(x + \sigma e_k, y) - g(x, y)}{\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

for $(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$, and nonzero $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Clearly, A_σ, Ψ_σ and G_σ are periodic in y. The ellipticity of A_σ follows immediately from (2.1). Indeed, A_σ satisfies

$$\lambda \|Q\| \le \operatorname{tr}(A_\sigma(y, s)Q) \le \Lambda \|Q\| \quad (Q \in \mathbb{S}^n, Q \ge 0), \tag{3.18}$$

for any $(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$. It should be remarked that the lower and the upper ellipticity bounds of A_σ are not only independent of σ but also the same as those of F.

By (2.3) and (3.13), we know that $A_\sigma \in C^{\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ and

$$\|A_\sigma\|_{C^{\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty))} \le C. \tag{3.19}$$

Let us remark here that we need Lipschitz regularity of D_pF in P in order to have (3.19).

Similarly, we may deduce from (2.3), (3.2) and (3.13) that $\Psi_\sigma \in C^{\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ satisfies

$$\|\Psi_\sigma\|_{C^{\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_0 s}\,\|\Psi_\sigma(\cdot,s)\|_{C^{\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C. \tag{3.20}$$

On the other hand, it follows directly from (2.6) that $G \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and

$$\|G_\sigma\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le K. \tag{3.21}$$

Now we define

$$V_\sigma(y,s) = \frac{v(x+\sigma e_k, y, s) - v(x,y,s)}{\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_\sigma = \frac{\bar v(x+\sigma e_k) - \bar v(x)}{\sigma},$$

for $(y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ and nonzero $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. Linearizing the equation (3.3), we see that V_σ is a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s V_\sigma = \operatorname{tr}(A_\sigma(y,s) D_y^2 V_\sigma) + \Psi_\sigma(y,s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ V_\sigma(y,0) = G_\sigma(y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{3.22}$$

Owing to (3.19) - (3.21), we observe that the equation (3.22) belongs to the same class of (3.3). Hence, Lemma 3.3 is applicable to the problem (3.22). In particular, the exponent β in the statement of Lemma 3.3 is replaced here by β_0. Thus, we obtain some $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_0$, depending only on n, λ, Λ and β_0, such that

$$\|V_\sigma\|_{C^{2,\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_1 s}\,\|V_\sigma(\cdot,s) - \Gamma_\sigma\|_{C^{2,\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C. \tag{3.23}$$

Now we invoke the compactness argument used in the proof of Lemma 3.4. Choose any sequence $\sigma_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Then by (3.23), there exist a subsequence $\{\tau_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ and a function $V \in C^{2,\bar\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ such that $V_{\tau_j} \to V$ in $C^{2,\hat\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ as $j \to \infty$, for any $0 < \hat\alpha < \bar\alpha$.

On the other hand, from the regularity assumptions on F and f ((2.3) and (3.2) respectively) and the continuity of $D_y^2 v(x,t,y,s)$ in (x,t) (Lemma 3.4), we deduce that $A_\sigma \to A$ and $\Psi_\sigma \to \Psi$ locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ as $\sigma \to 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} A(y,s) &= D_pF(D_y^2 v(x,y,s), x, y, s), \\ \Psi(y,s) &= D_{x_k}F(D_y^2 v(x,y,s), x, y, s) + D_{x_k} f(x,y,s). \end{aligned}$$

It also follows from the regularity assumption (2.6) on g that $G_\sigma \to G$ uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with

$$G(y) = D_{x_k} g(x,y).$$

Hence, it follows from the stability of viscosity solutions (see [CIL] for the details) that the limit function V of V_{τ_j} is a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} V_s = \operatorname{tr}(A(y,s) D_y^2 V) + \Psi(y,s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ V(y,0) = G(y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{3.24}$$

However, A, G and Ψ also satisfy (3.18), (3.21) and respectively (3.20). Thus, (3.24) belongs to the same class of (3.3), which implies that V is the unique (spatially

periodic) viscosity solution to (3.24). This shows that $V_\sigma \to V$ in $C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))$ as $\sigma \to 0$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. In other words,

$$V(y,s) = D_{x_k} v(x,y,s).$$

Equipped with the uniform estimate (3.23) and the observation that $V_\sigma \to V$, we may also prove that $\Gamma_\sigma \to \Gamma$ as $\sigma \to 0$, for some $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Since this part repeats the argument used in the end of the proof of Lemma 3.4, we skip the details. Let us remark that

$$\Gamma = D_{x_k} \bar{v}(x).$$

The second assertion of Lemma 3.5 can be justified by following the proof of Lemma 3.4 regarding (3.24). To avoid the redundancy of the argument, we omit the details. □

From the proof of Lemma 3.5, we observe that the regularity of v and $\bar{v}$ in (x,t) can be improved in a systematic way. Induction on the order of the derivatives (in (x,t)) of v and $\bar{v}$ leads us to the following proposition.

Proposition 3.7. *Under the assumptions* (2.1) - (2.6), (3.1) *and* (3.2), $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$, *for any* $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, *and* $\bar{v} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ *and*

(3.25)
$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu v(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_m s} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu (v(x,t,\cdot,s) - \bar{v}(x,t)) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right] \le C_m,$$

for all $(x,t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times [0,\infty)$ *and each integer* $m \ge 0$, *where* $0 < \beta_m < \beta$ *depends only on* n, λ, Λ, m *and* β, *and* $C_m > 0$ *depends only on* n, λ, Λ, α, β, m *and* K.

Remark 3.8. As pointed out in Remark 3.2, the proof of this proposition does not use the periodicity of F in s. Moreover, $0 < \beta_m < \cdots < \beta_0 < \beta$ for any $m \ge 1$ and C_m depends on the choice of $\beta_0, \cdots, \beta_m$.

Proof of Proposition 3.7. The proof of this proposition repeats that of Lemma 3.5. One may notice that although the statement of this lemma only involves the derivatives in x, the proof works equally well for the derivatives in t. Here we will only provide the sketch of the proof, and leave out the details to avoid redundancy.

Let V_k and $\bar{V}_k$ be the k-th order derivative (in (x,t)) of v and respectively $\bar{v}$. Let (P_k) be the equation which V_k solves, and suppose (as the induction hypothesis) that the coefficient A_k, the source term Ψ_k and the initial data G_k of (P_k) belong to the same class of (3.3). We know that this hypothesis is satisfied when $k = 1$, since in that case the equation (P_k) is precisely (3.24). By the induction hypothesis, Lemma 3.4 is applicable, which gives us higher regularity of V_k in the fast variables.

Now let $\{V_{k,\sigma}\}_{\sigma \neq 0}$ be the sequence of difference quotients of V_k (in (x,t)). To avoid confusion, let us denote by $(P_{k,\sigma})$ the equation for $V_{k,\sigma}$. Let us also denote by $A_{k,\sigma}$, $\Psi_{k,\sigma}$ and $G_{k,\sigma}$ the coefficient, the source term and respectively the initial data of $(P_{k,\sigma})$.

Following the proof of Lemma 3.5, we may observe that $(P_{k,\sigma})$ is obtained by linearizing (P_k). Utilizing the structure conditions of F, f and g, one may deduce that $(P_{k,\sigma})$ belongs to the same class of (P_k) with the structure conditions for $(P_{k,\sigma})$ being independent of σ. Moreover, one may observe from the regularity assumptions on F and f that $A_{k,\sigma}$ and $\Psi_{k,\sigma}$ converge to some A_{k+1} and Ψ_{k+1}, respectively, as $\sigma \to 0$ locally uniformly in the underlying domain of (y,s). Here one needs to use the

continuity of $D_y^2 V_k$ in (x,t) that will be given in the induction hypotheses. On the other hand, $G_{k,\sigma}$ will converge to some G_{k+1} uniformly in y, due to the regularity assumption on G.

Hence, the stability theory of viscosity solutions will ensure that any limit of $V_{k,\sigma}$ is a viscosity solution to the problem (P_{k+1}) having A_{k+1}, Ψ_{k+1} and G_{k+1} as the coefficient, the source term and, respectively, the initial data. Then the uniqueness of (viscosity) solutions to (P_{k+1}) will lead us to the observation that $V_{k,\sigma}$ converges to a single limit function, say V_{k+1}. In other words, V_k is differentiable (in (x,t)) and the corresponding derivative is V_{k+1}. Utilizing this fact, one may also prove that $\bar{V}_k$ is differentiable with the derivative being $\bar{V}_{k+1}$.

We observe that Lemma 3.4 provides us the desired estimate for V_k and $\bar{V}_k$, while Lemma 3.5 yields that for V_{k+1} and $\bar{V}_{k+1}$. The rest of the proof can now be finished by an induction argument. □

3.2. **Cell Problem.** Let us begin by stating a classical result in [E2] regarding cell problems. Here we provide a proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3.9. *For each $(P,x,t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, there exists a unique $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the following equation,*

$$w_s = F(D_y^2 w + P, x, t, y, s) - \gamma \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.26}$$

has a periodic viscosity solution $w \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Let us fix $(P,x,t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$. The proof is divided into two parts, namely the existence and the uniqueness of γ. We shall begin by proving the uniqueness.

Let γ be a constant such that (3.26) has a periodic viscosity solution $w \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$. Suppose towards a contradiction that there is another constant γ' such that the following equation,

$$w_s' = F(D_y^2 w' + P, x, t, y, s) - \gamma' \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R},$$

also has a periodic viscosity solution $w' \in BUC(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$.

Assume without loss of generality that $\gamma > \gamma'$. Adding a constant to w if necessary, we may suppose that $w < w'$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. This inequality is ensured by the global boundedness of w and w'. Then, for any sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta(w' - w) < \gamma - \gamma'$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\delta w' + w_s' - F(D_y^2 w' + P, x, t, y, s) \le \delta w + w_s - F(D_y^2 w + P, x, t, y, s) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R},$$

in the viscosity sense. Thus, it follows from the comparison principle [CIL] that $w \ge w'$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, which is a contradiction to our prior assumption that $w \le w'$. Hence, γ must be unique, if any.

Let us now prove the existence of γ. Consider the penalized problem,

$$w_s^\delta = F(D_y^2 w^\delta + P, x, t, y, s) - \delta w^\delta \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.27}$$

for each $\delta > 0$. Owing to the uniform ellipticity of F, there exists a unique viscosity solution to (3.27). In particular, the uniqueness implies $w^\delta = w^\delta(y,s)$ to be periodic in (y,s). We have in addition that

$$\left\| \delta w^\delta \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \le \|F(P,x,t,,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})}, \tag{3.28}$$

for all $\delta > 0$.

Define $\hat{w}^\delta = w^\delta - \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}} w^\delta$ on $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$. Let us write $Y = (-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})^n$ and $I = (-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$. Then $\hat{w}^\delta$ is a nonnegative viscosity solution to

$$\hat{w}^\delta_s = F(D^2_y\hat{w}^\delta + P, x, t, y, s) - \delta w^\delta \quad \text{in } (2Y)\times(3I). \tag{3.29}$$

Then the Harnack inequality implies that

$$\sup_{Y\times(I-1)} \hat{w}^\delta \le c_1\left(\inf_{Y\times(I+1)} \hat{w}^\delta + \left\|\delta w^\delta\right\|_{L^\infty((2Y)\times(3I))}\right), \tag{3.30}$$

where c_1 is a constant depending only on n, λ and Λ. By the periodicity of $\hat{w}^\delta$, we know that $\sup_{Y\times(I-1)} \hat{w}^\delta = \operatorname{osc}_{\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}} w^\delta$ and $\inf_{Y\times(I+1)} \hat{w}^\delta = 0$. Thus, we obtain from (3.30) and (3.28) that

$$\operatorname*{osc}_{\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}} w^\delta \le c_1 \left\|F(P, x, t, \cdot, \cdot)\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})}, \tag{3.31}$$

for all $\delta > 0$.

Let us define $\tilde{w}^\delta = w^\delta - w^\delta(0,0)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$. Then $\tilde{w}^\delta$ also solves (3.29) in the viscosity sense, whence it follows from the interior Hölder estimate [W1] (the so-called Krylov-Safanov theory) that $\tilde{w}^\delta \in C^\eta(\bar{Y}\times\bar{I})$ and

$$\left\|\tilde{w}^\delta\right\|_{C^\eta(\bar{Y}\times\bar{I})} \le c_2\left(\left\|\tilde{w}^\delta\right\|_{L^\infty((2Y)\times(3I))} + \left\|\delta w^\delta\right\|_{L^\infty((2Y)\times(3I))}\right),$$

where $0 < \eta < 1$ and $c_2 > 0$ depend only on n, λ and Λ. By the periodicity of $\tilde{w}^\delta$ and the estimates (3.31) and (3.28), we observe that $\tilde{w}^\delta \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$ with

$$\left\|\tilde{w}^\delta\right\|_{C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})} \le c_3 \left\|F(P, x, t, \cdot, \cdot)\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})}, \tag{3.32}$$

for all $\delta > 0$, where c_3 depends only on n, λ and Λ.

Owing to (3.28), (3.31) and (3.32), the Arzela-Ascoli theorem yields a positive sequence $\delta_i \to 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\delta_i w^{\delta_i} \to \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}^{\delta_i} \to w \quad \text{uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}, \tag{3.33}$$

as $i\to\infty$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. Then the stability theory [CIL] for viscosity solution yields that w is a (periodic) viscosity solution to (3.26) with the constant γ. This finishes the proof of the existence of γ. □

Remark 3.10. Let us remark that periodic viscosity solutions to (3.26), if any, are unique up to an additive constant. This is an *a priori* observation that can be proved as follows. Let w and w' be two periodic viscosity solutions to (3.26) with the same γ. Then $W = w - w'$ solves a linearized equation $W_s = \operatorname{tr}(A(y,s)D^2_y W)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$ in the viscosity sense, with $A(y,s)$ being bounded measurable and uniformly elliptic. However, W is globally bounded on $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$. Thus, the Liouville theorem [W1] yields that W is a constant function, and the claim is proved.

Remark 3.11. One shall notice from the uniqueness of γ that the convergence $\delta_i w^{\delta_i} \to \gamma$ in (3.33) is true for any (positive) sequence $\delta_i \to 0$. Moreover, it follows from Remark 3.10 that the convergence $\tilde{w}^{\delta_i} \to w$ also holds for any sequence $\delta_i \to 0$. The latter is because any (uniform) limit w of $\tilde{w}^{\delta_i}$ is always a periodic viscosity solution to (3.26) that satisfies $w(0,0) = 0$, regardless of which sequence $\delta_i \to 0$ one takes.

Let $\bar{F} : \mathbb{S}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\bar{F}(P, x, t) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \delta w^\delta(P, x, t, 0, 0), \tag{3.34}$$

where $w^\delta(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the unique viscosity solution to (3.27). The well-definedness of $\bar{F}$ is ensured by Remark 3.11. One may also notice from this remark that (3.34) simply reads $\bar{F}(P,x,t)=\gamma$, where γ is the unique constant satisfying Lemma 3.9.

Let us define $w:\mathbb{S}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$w(P,x,t,y,s)=\lim_{\delta\to 0}(w^\delta(P,x,t,y,s)-w^\delta(P,x,t,0,0)). \tag{3.35}$$

The well-definedness of w follows from Remark 3.10 and Remark 3.11. For the future reference, let us rewrite (3.26) using $\bar{F}$ and w as below: For each $(P,x,t)\in\mathbb{S}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]$, $w(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot)\in BUC(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$ is the periodic viscosity solution to the following equation,

$$w_s=F(D_y^2w+P,x,t,y,s)-\bar{F}(P,x,t)\quad\text{in }\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}, \tag{3.36}$$

that satisfies

$$w(P,x,t,0,0)=0.$$

Before we study the regularity of $\bar{F}$ and w in the slow variables, let us collect basic structure conditions on $\bar{F}$ in the following lemma. One may find a proof for this lemma in [E2], but we provide it for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3.12. *$\bar{F}$ is uniformly elliptic in the sense of* (2.1)*; that is,*

$$\lambda\,\|Q\|\le\bar{F}(P+Q,x,t)-\bar{F}(P,x,t)\le\Lambda\,\|Q\|\quad(Q\in\mathbb{S}^n,Q\ge 0),$$

for any $(P,x,t)\in\mathbb{S}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]$. Moreover, $\bar{F}$ is concave in P; that is,

$$\rho\bar{F}(P,x,t)+(1-\rho)\bar{F}(Q,x,t)\le\bar{F}(\rho P+(1-\rho)Q,x,t)\quad(Q\in\mathbb{S}^n,\rho\in[0,1]),$$

for any $(P,x,t)\in\mathbb{S}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]$.

Proof. Let us fix $(P,x,t)\in\mathbb{S}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]$ throughout the proof. Assume to the contrary that there is some $Q\in\mathbb{S}^n$ that satisfies $Q\ge 0$ and

$$\lambda\,\|Q\|+\bar{F}(P,x,t)>\bar{F}(P+Q,x,t).$$

For simplicity, let us write $w^{P+Q}(y,s)=w(P+Q,x,t,y,s)$ and $w^P(y,s)=w(P,x,t,y,s)$. By the assumption above and the ellipticity condition (2.1) of F, we observe that w^{P+Q} solves

$$\begin{aligned}w_s^{P+Q}&=F(D_y^2w^{P+Q}+P+Q,x,t,y,s)-\bar{F}(P,x,t)\\&\ge F(D_y^2w^{P+Q}+P,x,t,y,s)+\lambda\,\|Q\|-\bar{F}(P,x,t)\\&>F(D_y^2w^{P+Q}+P,x,t,y,s)-\bar{F}(P,x,t)\quad\text{in }\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R},\end{aligned}$$

in the viscosity sense. In other words, w^{P+Q} is a (strict) supersolution to the equation which w^P solves. To this end, we may follow the uniqueness part of the proof of Lemma 3.9, and arrive at a contradiction.

The second assertion can be proved by a similar argument as above, and we omit the details. □

We shall now study the regularity of $\bar{F}$ and w in (P,x,t), which follows closely to the authors' previous work [KL]. We begin by improving the regularity of w in the fast variables (y,s), based on the interior $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates [W2] for viscosity solutions to concave equations.

Lemma 3.13. *There exists $0 < \bar{\alpha} \le \alpha$ depending only on n, λ, Λ and α such that $w(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ with*

$$\|w(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})} \le C\,\|P\|\,, \tag{3.37}$$

for each $(P,x,t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, where $C > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, α and K. Moreover, $w \in C(\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$.

Proof. Fix $(P,x,t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, and write $Y = (-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})^n$ and $I = (-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$. For notational convenience, let us skip the dependence of F on (x,t), and simply write $w(y,s) = w(P,x,t,y,s)$ and $\gamma = \bar{F}(P,x,t)$. Since we have

$$w_s = F(D_y^2 w + P, y, s) - \gamma \quad \text{in } (2Y)\times(2I),$$

in the viscosity sense, it follows from the concavity and the C^α regularity of F in (y,s) that the interior $C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}$ estimate [W2] is available for some $0 < \bar{\alpha} \le \alpha$, which depends only on n, λ, Λ and α. As a result, we obtain $w \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{Y}\times\bar{I})$ with

$$\|w\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{Y}\times\bar{I})} \le c_1\left(\|w\|_{L^\infty((2Y)\times(2I))} + \|F(P,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{C^\alpha((2Y)\times(2I))} + |\gamma|\right). \tag{3.38}$$

Now utilizing (3.28), (3.34), (2.1) and (2.3) (with $m = 0$), we have $|\gamma| \le C\,\|P\|$ and $\|F(P,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})} \le C\,\|P\|$. On the other hand, we deduce from (3.32) and (3.35) that $\|w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})} \le C\,\|P\|$. Thus, combining the last three inequalities with (3.38), and utilizing the periodicity of w, we arrive at (3.37). This proves the first part of Lemma 3.13.

The second part of Lemma 3.13 follows easily from (3.37). Suppose that $(P_i,x_i,t_i) \to (P,x,t)$ as $i \to \infty$, and write $\gamma_i = \bar{F}(P_i,x_i,t_i)$ and $w_i(y,s) = w(P_i,x_i,t_i,y,s)$. Then (3.37) yields that the sequences $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ and $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ are bounded in $\mathbb{R}$ and, respectively, in $C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$. Hence, any subsequence of $\{(\gamma_i,w_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ contains a further subsequence which converges in $\mathbb{R}\times C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. However, we deduce from the stability [CIL] of viscosity solutions that any limit (γ',w') of $\{(\gamma_i,w_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ should satisfy $w'_s = F(D_y^2 w' + P, x, t, y, s) - \gamma'$ in $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$ in the viscosity sense. Then Lemma 3.9 ensures that $\gamma' = \gamma$. Moreover, since $w_i(0,0) = 0$ for any $i = 1,2,\cdots$, we have $w'(0,0) = 0$. Thus, it follows from Remark 3.10 that $w = w'$. Therefore, $\gamma_i \to \gamma$ and $w_i \to w$ as $s \to \infty$, with the latter convergence being held in $C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. Now since w_i and w are all periodic, we have $w_i \to w$ in $C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. This proves that $\bar{F}$ and w are continuous in (P,x,t). □

With the above lemma at hand, we can proceed with the proof of (continuous) differentiability of $\bar{F}$ and w in (P,x,t). The proof is also similar to that of Lemma 3.5.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the Hölder exponent chosen in Lemma 3.13. Then there exist $D_p^\kappa D_x^\mu \bar{F}(P,x,t)$ and $D_p^\kappa D_x^\mu w(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})$, for any pair (κ,μ) of multi-indices satisfying $|\kappa| + |\mu| = 1$, such that*

$$\left|D_p^\kappa D_x^\mu \bar{F}(P,x,t)\right| + \left\|D_p^\kappa D_x^\mu w(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot)\right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})} \le C\,\|P\|^{1-|\kappa|}\,,$$

for any $(P,x,t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, where $C > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, α and K. Moreover, we have $\bar{F} \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ and $w \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$.

Remark 3.15. As pointed out in Remark 3.6, C^1 regularity in (P, x, t) does not involve that in t, according to the parabolic terminology.

Proof of Lemma 3.14. In this proof, we use C to denote a positive constant that depends only on n, λ, Λ, α and K, and allow it to vary from one line to another. We shall prove this lemma for the derivatives in P only, since the same argument applies to the proof for the derivatives in x. Fix $(P, x, t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, T]$ and $1 \le i, j \le n$. Recall from Section 2 that by E_{ij} we denote the (i, j)-th standard basis matrix in $\mathbb{S}^n$. For notational convenience, we shall skip the dependence of F, w and $\bar{F}$ on (x, t). Define

$$A_\sigma(y,s) = \int_0^1 D_p F(\rho D_y^2 w(P + \sigma E_{ij}, y, s) + (1-\rho) D_y^2 w(P, y, s) + \rho\sigma E_{ij}, y, s) d\rho,$$

$$W_\sigma(y,s) = \frac{w(P + \sigma E_{ij}, y, s) - w(P, y, s)}{\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_\sigma = \frac{\bar{F}(P + \sigma E_{ij}) - \bar{F}(P)}{\sigma},$$

for $(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. By linearization, we deduce that W_σ is a (viscosity) solution to

$$\partial_s W_\sigma = \operatorname{tr}(A_\sigma(y,s)(D_y^2 W_\sigma + E_{ij})) - \Gamma_\sigma \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.39}$$

Clearly, A_σ is periodic on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. More importantly, A_σ is uniformly elliptic in the sense of (3.18) and Hölder continuous with the uniform estimate (3.19). It should be stressed that the lower and upper ellipticity bounds for of A_σ are given by λ and, respectively, Λ and are independent of σ. Hence, (3.39) belongs to the same class of (3.36). As a result, Lemma 3.13 is applicable to (3.39). This yields that $W_\sigma \in C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ and

$$|\Gamma_\sigma| + \|W_\sigma\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \le C \left\| E_{ij} \right\| \le C. \tag{3.40}$$

Notice that Lemma 3.13 ensures $w \in C(\mathbb{S}^n; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. This combined with uniform ellipticity (2.1) of F yields that we have $A_\sigma \to A$ in $C^{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ as $\sigma \to 0$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, where

$$A(y,s) = D_p F(D_y^2 w(P, y, s) + P, y, s).$$

On the other hand, the uniform estimate (3.40) and the periodicity of W_σ implies that any subsequence of $\{(\Gamma_\sigma, W_\sigma)\}_{\sigma \neq 0}$ contains a further subsequence that converges in $\mathbb{R} \times C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$. However, the stability [CIL] of viscosity solutions ensures that a (uniform) limit (Γ, W) of $\{(\Gamma_\sigma, W_\sigma)\}_{\sigma \neq 0}$, if any, should satisfy

$$W_s = \operatorname{tr}(A(y,s)(D_y^2 W + E_{ij})) - \Gamma \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.41}$$

in the viscosity sense. Since A is periodic and uniformly elliptic (in the sense of (3.18)) and W is also periodic, Lemma 3.9 applies to (3.41). This proves the uniqueness of Γ. Moreover, since $W_\sigma(0,0) = 0$ for all nonzero σ, the limit W should also be unique, owing to Remark 3.10. Therefore, $\Gamma_\sigma \to \Gamma$ and $W_\sigma \to W$ as $\sigma \to 0$, where the latter holds in $C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$.

By the definition of Γ_σ and W_σ, we conclude that $\bar{F}$ and w are differentiable at P in direction E_{ij} with

$$\Gamma = D_{p_{ij}} \bar{F}(P) \quad \text{and} \quad W(y,s) = D_{p_{ij}} w(P, y, s).$$

The rest of the proof then follows from Lemma 3.13, and hence we omit the details. □

The following proposition is obtained by induction on the order of derivatives of $\bar{F}$ and w in the slow variables (P, x, t).

Proposition 3.16. *Assume that F verifies* (2.1) - (2.3)*, and let $\bar{F}$ and w be defined by* (3.34) *and respectively* (3.35)*. Then $\bar{F} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ and $w \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, and*

(3.42)
$$\sum_{|\kappa|+|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left| D_p^\kappa D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \bar{F}(P,x,t) \right| + \left\| D_p^\kappa D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu w(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \right] \le C_m \, \|P\|^{(1-|\kappa|)_+},$$

for all $(P,x,t) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and for each integer $m \ge 0$, where $0 < \bar{\alpha} \le \alpha$ depends only on n, λ, Λ and α, and $C_m > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, m and K.

Proof. One may notice that the higher regularity of $\bar{F}$ and w in the slow variables (P,x,t) can be obtained by inductively applying Lemma 3.14 on the number of derivatives. Since the whole argument resembles that of the proof of Proposition 3.7, we omit the details. □

4. Higher Order Convergence Rate

This section is devoted to achieving the higher order convergence rates of the homogenization process of (1.1). We expect that after a short time, the solution u^ε of (1.1) becomes unaffected by the rapidly oscillatory behavior of the initial data, and that it rather behaves as a solution to certain Cauchy problem with a non-oscillatory initial data. Thus, it is reasonable to split u^ε into the non-oscillatory part $\bar{u}^\varepsilon$ and the oscillatory part $\tilde{v}^\varepsilon$ near the initial time layer; by the region "near the initial time layer" we indicate the set of points (x,t) with $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < t \ll \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon|$.

For this reason, we construct two types of the higher order correctors associated with the homogenization problem (1.1), namely the initial layer corrector and the interior corrector. The former type captures the oscillatory behavior of $\tilde{v}^\varepsilon$ near the initial time layer, while the latter describes that of $\bar{u}^\varepsilon$ in the interior. The construction of these correctors of higher orders will be based on the regularity theory (in the slow variables) established in Section 3.

Throughout this section, the constants $K > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ will be used to denote those in (2.3) and (2.6).

4.1. Initial Layer Corrector.

In this subsection, we aim at proving the following proposition. Throughout this subsection, we denote by $\beta_{k,m}$ a positive constant that depends only on n, λ, Λ, k and m, and by $C_{k,m}$ a positive constant that depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, k, m and K. We shall also let them vary from one line to another.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume F and g verify* (2.1) - (2.3) *and* (2.5) - (2.6)*. Then there exist a sequence $\{\tilde{v}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ that are periodic in their third argument and a sequence $\{\bar{g}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that the following are true.*

(i) $\tilde{v}_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, and

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \tilde{v}_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_{k,m} s} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \tilde{v}_k(x,t,\cdot,s) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right] \le C_{k,m}, \tag{4.1}$$

for any $(x,t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times [0,\infty)$ and each integer $m \ge 0$.

(ii) $\bar{g}_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *and*

$$\sum_{|\mu|=m} \left| D_x^\mu \bar{g}_k(x) \right| \le C_{k,m}, \tag{4.2}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and each integer* $m \ge 0$.

(iii) Define $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\bar{g}_m^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *by*

$$\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon(x,t) = \sum_{k=0}^m \varepsilon^k \tilde{v}_k\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{g}_m^\varepsilon(x) = \sum_{k=0}^m \varepsilon^k \bar{g}_k(x), \tag{4.3}$$

for each integer $m \ge 0$ *and each real number* $\varepsilon > 0$. *Then* $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon$ *and* $\bar{g}_m^\varepsilon$ *satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon = \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} F\left(\varepsilon^2 D^2 \tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon, x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \psi_m^\varepsilon\left(x,t,\dfrac{x}{\varepsilon},\dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon(x,0) + \bar{g}_m^\varepsilon(x) = g\left(x,\dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

with some $\psi_m^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ *that verifies*

$$\left| \psi_m^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s) \right| \le C_m \varepsilon^{m-1} e^{-\beta_m s}, \tag{4.5}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ *and any* $0 < \varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$.

Remark 4.2. We shall see later that this proposition does not require F to satisfy (2.2); instead, we only need it to be periodic in the fast spatial variable y.

Remark 4.3. Due to (4.1), we know that $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon$ decays as $\varepsilon \to 0$, once t stays positive. We shall see later in Subsection 4.3 that $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon$ is the truncated version of the oscillatory part of the solution u^ε to (1.1) near the initial time layer. For this reason, we call $\tilde{v}_k$ the k-th order initial layer corrector, and $\bar{g}_k$ the k-th order effective initial data.

Let us begin with heuristic arguments by the formal expansion. The computation presented here uses the Taylor expansion of F in its matrix variable P. We should mention that such an approach has already been shown in the authors' previous work [KL].

Differentiating $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon$ with respect to t, we obtain

$$\varepsilon^2 \partial_t \tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon(x,t) = \sum_{k=0}^m \varepsilon^k \partial_s \tilde{v}_k\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \sum_{k=0}^m \varepsilon^{k+2} \partial_t \tilde{v}_k\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right). \tag{4.6}$$

In order to proceed with the derivatives of $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon$ in variable x, let us introduce the mapping $V_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{S}^n$ defined by

$$V_k(x,t,y,s) = D_y^2 \tilde{v}_k(x,t,y,s) + (D_x D_y + D_y D_x)\tilde{v}_{k-1}(x,t,y,s) + D_x^2 \tilde{v}_{k-2}(x,t,y,s), \tag{4.7}$$

for each $k \ge 0$, where $\tilde{v}_k$ is chosen by the identically zero function when $k \in \{-2,-1\}$. Replacing V_{m+1} and V_{m+2} by $(D_x D_y + D_y D_x)v_m + D_x^2 \tilde{v}_{m-1}$ and $D_x^2 \tilde{v}_m$ respectively, for the moment, we have

$$F\left(\varepsilon^2 D^2 \tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon(x,t), x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) = F\left(\sum_{k=0}^{m+2} \varepsilon^k V_k\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right), x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right). \tag{4.8}$$

For notational convenience, let us write

$$B_k(x,t,y,s) = D_p^k F(V_0(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s), \tag{4.9}$$

for $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$, and especially $B = B_1$. Recall from Section 2 that we understand $B_k(x,t,y,s)$ as the symmetric k-linear functional on $(\mathbb{S}^n)^k$. We shall also define $\Phi_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_0(x,t,y,s) = B_0(x,t,y,s)$$

if $k = 0$, and by

$$\Phi_k(x,t,y,s) = \sum_{l=1}^{k} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_l=k \\ i_1,\cdots,i_l \geq 1}} B_l(x,t,y,s)(V_{i_1}(x,t,y,s),\cdots,V_{i_l}(x,t,y,s)),$$

if $k \geq 1$.

Denoting by $T_m(P_0,P)$ the m-th order Taylor polynomial of F in P at P_0, namely,

$$T_m(P_0,P)(x,t,y,s) = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \frac{1}{k!} D_p^k F(P_0,x,t,y,s)(P,\cdots,P),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &T_m\left(V_0, \sum_{k=1}^{m+2} \varepsilon^k V_k\right)(x,t,y,s) - \sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon^k \Phi_k(x,t,y,s) \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^{m+2} \sum_{\substack{m+1 \leq i_1+\cdots+i_k \leq k(m+2) \\ 1 \leq i_1,\cdots,i_k \leq m+2}} \frac{\varepsilon^{i_1+\cdots+i_k}}{k!} B_k(x,t,y,s)(V_{i_1}(x,t,y,s),\cdots,V_{i_k}(x,t,y,s)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Thus, by the m-th order Taylor expansion of F in P at V_0, we obtain from (4.8) and (4.10) that

$$F\left(\varepsilon^2 D^2 \tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon(x,t), x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon^k \Phi_k\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + E_m^\varepsilon\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right), \tag{4.11}$$

for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T)$, where $E_m^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined so as to satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &E_m^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s) - R_m\left(V_0, \sum_{k=1}^{m+2} \varepsilon^k V_k\right)(x,t,y,s) \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^{m+2} \sum_{\substack{m+1 \leq i_1+\cdots+i_k \leq k(m+2) \\ 1 \leq i_1,\cdots,i_k \leq m+2}} \frac{\varepsilon^{i_1+\cdots+i_k}}{k!} B_k(x,t,y,s)(V_{i_1}(x,t,y,s),\cdots,V_{i_k}(x,t,y,s)), \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

with $R_m(P_0,P)$ being the m-th order remainder term (of F in P at P_0).

Hence, plugging $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon$ into (1.1) and equating the power of ε, we derive the following equation from (4.6) and (4.11),

$$\partial_s \tilde{v}_k(x,t,y,s) + \partial_t \tilde{v}_{k-2}(x,t,y,s) = \Phi_k(x,t,y,s), \tag{4.13}$$

for each $k \geq 0$; let us recall that $\tilde{v}_k$ is chosen by the identically zero function if $k \in \{-2,-1\}$.

Lemma 4.4. *There exists a sequence $\{v_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, which are periodic in the third argument, such that the following are true.*

(i) Define $\tilde{v}_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\bar{g}_k : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *by*

$$\tilde{v}_k(x,t,y,s) = v_k(x,t,y,s) - \lim_{s\to\infty} v_k(x,t,0,s) \quad \textit{and} \quad \bar{g}_k(x) = \lim_{s\to\infty} v_k(x,0,0,s). \tag{4.14}$$

Then $\tilde{v}_k$ *and* $\bar{g}_k$ *satisfy* (4.1) *and* (4.2) *respectively.*

(ii) $v_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s v_k(x,t,y,s) + \partial_t \tilde{v}_{k-2}(x,t,y,s) = \Phi_k(x,t,y,s) & \textit{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ v_k(x,t,y,0) = g_k(x,y) & \textit{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{4.15}$$

in the classical sense, where we take $\tilde{v}_{-2}$ *and* $\tilde{v}_{-1}$ *by the identically zero functions, and denote by* g_0 *the function* g *and by* g_k *the identically zero function for each* $k \geq 1$.

Proof. Let us define $v_0 : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ in such a way that $v_0(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the spatially periodic solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s v_0 = F(D_y^2 v_0, x, t, y, s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ v_0(x,t,y,0) = g(x,y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{4.16}$$

for each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$. By Lemma 3.1, $\{v_0(x,t,0,s)\}_{s>0}$ converges as $s \to \infty$ and, hence, one can ddefine $\tilde{v}_0$ and $\bar{g}_0$ as in (4.14). Moreover, the estimates (4.1) and (4.2) follow from Proposition 3.7. Now as we define V_0 by (4.7), that is $V_0 = D_y^2 \tilde{v}_0 = D_y^2 v_0$, we see that (4.16) implies (4.15) for $k = 0$ (because $\tilde{v}_{-2}$ is the identically zero function). This establishes the initial case of the induction argument.

Now fix an integer $k \geq 1$ and suppose (as the induction hypothesis) that we have v_k that satisfies assertion (i), for $0 \leq k \leq r-1$. Then by (4.1), the mapping V_k defined by (4.7) satisfies $V_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, with

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu V_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_{k,m} s} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu V_k(x,t,\cdot,s) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right] \leq C_{k,m}, \tag{4.17}$$

for any $(x,t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times [0,\infty)$ and any integer $m \geq 0$, for each $0 \leq k \leq r-1$. Moreover, it follows from (2.3) that $B_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, for each $k \geq 0$, and

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu B_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_{k,m} s} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu B_k(x,t,\cdot,s) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right] \leq C_{k,m}, \tag{4.18}$$

for any $(x,t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times [0,\infty)$ and any integer $m \geq 0$.

Define $f_r : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &f_r(x,t,y,s) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(B(x,t,y,s)(2D_x D_y \tilde{v}_{r-1}(x,t,y,s) + D_x^2 \tilde{v}_{r-2}(x,t,y,s))) - \partial_t \tilde{v}_{r-2}(x,t,y,s) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=2}^{r} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_l=r \\ i_1,\cdots,i_l \geq 2}} B_l(x,t,y,s)(V_{i_1}(x,t,y,s), \cdots, V_{i_l}(x,t,y,s)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

One may notice that the definition (4.19) of f_r involves $\tilde{v}_{k-1}$, $\tilde{v}_{k-2}$, $\{B_k\}_{k=1}^r$ and $\{V_k\}_{k=1}^{r-1}$ only. Thus, it follows from the induction hypothesis (that is, assertion (i) of this

lemma) together with the estimates (4.17) and (4.18) that $f_r \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, and

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu f_r(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty))} + e^{\beta_{k,m} s} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu f_r(x,t,\cdot,s) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right] \le C_{r,m}, \tag{4.20}$$

for any $(x,t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times [0,\infty)$ and each integer $m \ge 0$.

Now it follows from the classical existence theory [CIL] for viscosity solutions that there is a (unique) function $v_r : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ for which $v_r(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the spatially periodic solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s v_r = \operatorname{tr}(B(x,t,y,s) D_y^2 v_r) + f_r(x,t,y,s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ v_r(x,t,y,0) = g_r(x,y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{4.21}$$

for each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$. Equipped with the decay estimate (4.20) for f_r, one may use Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.7 (with $F(P,x,t,y,s) = \operatorname{tr}(B(x,t,y,s)P)$, $g(x,y) = 0$ and $f(x,t,y,s) = f_r(x,t,y,s)$) to ensure that assertion (i) of this lemma is indeed true. As a result, v_r satisfies (4.21) in the classical sense, whence we have the identity

$$\operatorname{tr}(B(x,t,y,s) D_y^2 v_r(x,t,y,s)) + f_r(x,t,y,s) = \Phi_r(x,t,y,s) - \partial_t \tilde{v}_{r-2}(x,t,y,s),$$

for each $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$. Thus, the proof is finished by the induction principle. □

Remark 4.5. Let us remark that the proof above does not involve the periodicity of F in the fast temporal variable s. This is why Proposition 4.1 holds even if we only assume the spatial periodicity of F (that is periodicity in y), as mentioned in Remark 4.2.

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.1

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $\{v_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be the sequence taken from Lemma 4.4 and define $\tilde{v}_k$ and $\bar{g}_k$ by (4.14). Then it follows from the equation (4.15) and the heuristic computation performed before Lemma 4.4 (that is, (4.6), (4.11) and (4.13)) that the functions $\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon$ and $\bar{g}_m^\varepsilon$ defined by (4.3) satisfy (4.4) with

$$\psi_m^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s) = \sum_{k=m-1}^{m} \varepsilon^k \partial_t \tilde{v}_k(x,t,y,s) - \varepsilon^{-2} E_m^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s),$$

where E_m^ε is given by (4.12). The rest of the proof is devoted to showing the exponential decay estimate (4.5) for ψ_m^ε.

Let us denote by β_m a positive constant that is determined only by n, λ, Λ and m, and C_m a positive constant that depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, m, T and K. We shall also allow them to vary from one line to another.

By (4.1), we know that

$$\sum_{k=m-1}^{m} \varepsilon^k \left| \partial_t \tilde{v}_k(x,t,y,s) \right| \le C_m \varepsilon^{m-1} e^{-\beta_m s}, \tag{4.22}$$

for any $0 < \varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$. The decay estimate for E_m^ε is proved as follows.

As R_m being the m-th order remainder term in the Taylor expansion of F, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|R_m\left(V_0,\sum_{k=1}^{m+2}\varepsilon^k V_k\right)(x,t,y,s)\right| &\le C_m\varepsilon^{m+1}\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{m+2}\varepsilon^{k-1}V_k(x,t,y,s)\right\|^{m+1}\\ &\le C_m\varepsilon^{m+1}e^{-\beta_m s},\end{aligned}\tag{4.23}$$

provided that $0<\varepsilon\le\frac{1}{2}$, where the second inequality follows (4.17). On the other hand, utilizing (4.18) and (4.1), we derive that

$$\left|B_k(V_{i_1},\cdots,V_{i_k})\right|(x,t,y,s)\le C_m e^{-\beta_m s},\tag{4.24}$$

for any $1\le k\le m$ and $1\le i_1,\cdots,i_k=m+2$.

Collecting (4.23) and (4.24), and noting the fact that the summation indices $i_1,\cdots,i_k$ in the definition of E_m^ε are subject to the restriction $i_1+\cdots+i_k\ge m+1$, we deduce that

$$\left|E_m^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s)\right|\le C_m\varepsilon^{m+1}e^{-\beta_m s},\tag{4.25}$$

for all $0<\varepsilon\le\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, (4.5) follows from (4.22), (4.23) and (4.25). □

We are going to finish this subsection with a more general version of Proposition 4.1. Following the proof of the proposition, we realize that we can add more source terms that oscillate periodically in the fast spatial variable but decay exponentially as the fast temporal variable approaches the infinity. We shall see later that the proof of our main result, Theorem 1.1, leads us to such a general extent.

Proposition 4.6. *Assume F verifies* (2.1) - (2.3). *Let $d\ge 0$ and $m\ge 2d$ be integers and define $F_{d,m}^\varepsilon:\mathbb{S}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$ by*

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon^{2d+2}F_{d,m}^\varepsilon(P,x,t,y,s) &= F\left(\varepsilon^{2d+2}P+\sum_{k=0}^{m}\varepsilon^k(X_{d,k}+Y_{d,k})(x,t,y,s),x,t,y,s\right)\\ &\quad -F\left(\sum_{k=0}^{m}\varepsilon^k(X_{d,k}+Y_{d,k})(x,t,y,s),x,t,y,s\right),\end{aligned}\tag{4.26}$$

with sequences $\{X_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ and $\{Y_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ of $\mathbb{S}^n$-valued mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$ and, respectively, on $\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty)$, for which the former are periodic in their third and fourth arguments and satisfy (4.46), *whereas the latter are periodic in their third argument and satisfy* (4.17). *Let us also define $f_{d,m}^\varepsilon:\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$ by*

$$\varepsilon^{2d+2}f_{d,m}^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s)=\sum_{k=0}^{m}\varepsilon^k f_{d,k}(x,t,y,s),\tag{4.27}$$

with a sequence $\{f_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,\infty)$ that satisfy (3.1) *and* (3.2). *Moreover, we set $g_{d,m}^\varepsilon:\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ by*

$$g_{d,m}^\varepsilon(x,y)=\sum_{k=0}^{m-2d}\varepsilon^k g_{d,k}(x,y),\tag{4.28}$$

with a sequence $\{g_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfy (2.5) *and* (2.6).

Under these circumstances, there exist a sequence $\{\tilde{v}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ *of functions on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$, *which are periodic in their third argument, and a sequence* $\{\bar{g}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ *of functions on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that the following are true.*

(i) $\tilde{v}_{d,k} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)))$, *for any* $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, *and the estimate* (4.1) *holds for any integer* $m \geq 0$.

(ii) $\bar{g}_{d,k} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *and the estimate* (4.2) *holds for any integer* $m \geq 0$.

(iii) Define $\tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\bar{g}^\varepsilon_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *by*

$$\tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-2d} \varepsilon^k \tilde{v}_{d,k}\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon^k \bar{g}^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-2d} \bar{g}_{d,k}(x), \tag{4.29}$$

for any integer $m \geq 2d$ *and any real number* $\varepsilon > 0$. *Then* $\tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ *and* $\bar{g}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ *satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m} = F^\varepsilon_{d,m}\left(D^2\tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}, x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \\ \qquad\qquad + f^\varepsilon_{d,m}\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \psi^\varepsilon_{d,m}\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,0) + \bar{g}^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x) = g^\varepsilon_{d,m}\left(x,\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{4.30}$$

with some $\psi^\varepsilon_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ *verifying*

$$\left|\psi^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t,y,s)\right| \leq C_{d,m}\varepsilon^{m-2d-1}e^{-\beta_{d,m}s}, \tag{4.31}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ *and any* $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. The proof of this proposition basically follow that of Proposition 4.1. Nevertheless, we need to check some computation to make sure that the argument of the proof of the preceding proposition is indeed available here. We will only show the heuristic computation to avoid any repeated argument.

It suffices to consider the case $d = 0$ in order to exploit the idea. To simplify the exposition of our argument, let us write by k the subindex $(0,k)$. As before, the key step here is to derive (4.13) with a suitable Φ_k.

Take V_k by (4.7) for $k \geq 0$, and write

$$B_k(x,t,y,s) = D_p^k F((X_0 + Y_0 + V_0)(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s).$$

Set Φ_k in such a way that we have

$$\Phi_0(x,t,y,s) - f_0(x,t,y,s) = B_0(x,t,y,s),$$

if $k = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi_k(x,t,y,s) - f_k(x,t,y,s) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{k} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_l=k \\ i_1,\cdots,i_l \geq 1}} \big[B_l(x,t,y,s)((X_{i_1} + Y_{i_1} + V_{i_1})(x,t,y,s), \cdots, (X_{i_l} + Y_{i_l} + V_{i_l})(x,t,y,s)) \\ &\qquad\qquad - B_l(x,t,y,s)((X_{i_1} + Y_{i_1})(x,t,y,s), \cdots, (X_{i_l} + Y_{i_l})(x,t,y,s))\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Following the (m-th order) Taylor expansion of F in the matrix variable P that we have already done in (4.10) and (4.11), we arrive at

$$\varepsilon^2 F_m^\varepsilon\left(D^2\tilde{v}_m^\varepsilon(x,t),x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)+\varepsilon^2 f_m^\varepsilon\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)=\sum_{k=0}^{m}\varepsilon^k\Phi_k\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)+E_m^\varepsilon\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right),$$

for some suitable E_m^ε. Equating the power of ε of the right hand side of the last identity and that of (4.6), we arrive at (4.13) with Φ_k defined by as above.

Now due to the assumptions imposed on X_k, Y_k, f_k and g_k, we may construct the desired sequences $\{\tilde{v}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ and $\{\bar{g}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ by the induction argument in the proof of Lemma 4.4. Especially the initial data g_k in (4.15) is replaced by that given in the statement of Proposition 4.6.

The error estimates of the remainder term ψ_m^ε can be derived by arguing analogously as in the proof of Proposition 4.1. We leave out all the details to the reader. □

4.2. **Interior Corrector.** In this subsection, we shall construct the higher order interior correctors for the problem (1.1). Throughout this subsection, $C_{k,m}$ is used to denote a positive constant that depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, k, m, T and K, and may vary from one line to another.

Proposition 4.7. *Assume that F satisfies* (2.1) - (2.3) *and let $\{\bar{g}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be a sequence of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfy* (4.2). *Then there exist a sequence $\{\tilde{w}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$, which are periodic in both of their third and fourth arguments, such that the following are true.*

(i) $\tilde{w}_k\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T];C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}))$, for any $0<\hat{\alpha}<\bar{\alpha}$, and

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m}\left\|D_x^\mu\partial_t^\nu\tilde{w}_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)\right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R})}\le C_{k,m} \tag{4.32}$$

for any $(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]$ and any integer $m\ge 0$

(ii) $\tilde{w}_k$ is independent of its third and fourth argument for $k\in\{0,1\}$ and we have

$$\tilde{w}_k(x,0,0,0)=\bar{g}_k(x), \tag{4.33}$$

for any $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and for each $k\ge 0$.

(iii) Define $\tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon:\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon(x,t)=\sum_{k=0}^{m}\varepsilon^k\tilde{w}_k\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right),$$

for each integer $m\ge 0$ and each real number $\varepsilon>0$. Then $\tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon$ solves

$$\partial_t\tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}F\left(\varepsilon^2D^2\tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon,x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)+\psi_m^\varepsilon\left(x,t,\frac{x}{\varepsilon},\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\quad\text{in }\mathbb{R}^n\times(0,T), \tag{4.34}$$

with some $\psi_m^\varepsilon:\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ that verifies

$$\left|\psi_m^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s)\right|\le C_m\varepsilon^{m-1}, \tag{4.35}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$ and any $0<\varepsilon\le\frac{1}{2}$.

Remark 4.8. By Proposition 4.7 (ii), we see that the zeroth and the first order interior correctors for the problem (1.1) are non-oscillatory in ε-scales. We will see later in Lemma 4.9 that they are exactly the zeroth and the first order effective limit profiles

for the problem (1.1). This shows that the rapid oscillation of the initial data of (1.1) only affects the solution near the initial time layer, and the influence quickly dissipates as soon as one stays inside the interior of the underlying domain.

In coherence with the definition (4.7) of V_k, let us define $W_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{S}^n$ by

$$W_k(x,t,y,s) = D_y^2 \tilde{w}_k(x,t,y,s) + (D_x D_y + D_y D_x)\tilde{w}_{k-1}(x,t,y,s) + D_x^2 \tilde{w}_{k-2}(x,t,y,s), \tag{4.36}$$

for each $k \geq 0$, with $\tilde{w}_k$ being understood as the identically zero function when $k \in \{-2,-1\}$. Similarly as in the definition (4.9) of B_k, we shall write

$$A_k(x,t,y,s) = D_p^k F(0,x,t,y,s) \tag{4.37}$$

for $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, for each integer $k \geq 0$, and simply denote $A = A_1$. Following the formal computation in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we derive that $\tilde{w}_k$ should solve the following recursively defined equation,

$$\partial_s \tilde{w}_k(x,t,y,s) + \partial_t \tilde{w}_{k-2}(x,t,y,s) = \Phi_k(x,t,y,s),$$

for each $k \geq 2$, where $\Phi_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\Phi_k(x,t,y,s) = \sum_{l=2}^{k} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_l=k \\ i_1,\cdots,i_l \geq 2}} A_l(x,t,y,s)(W_{i_1}(x,t,y,s),\cdots,W_{i_l}(x,t,y,s)).$$

The following lemma can be considered as the counterpart of Lemma 4.4. Let us remark that the proof is essentially the same with that in the authors' previous work [KL] (where the elliptic equations are in concern), but we present it for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 4.9. *There exist a sequence $\{w_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, which are periodic in their third and fourth arguments, and a sequence $\{\bar{u}_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ such that the following are true.*

(i) Define $\tilde{w}_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{w}_k(x,t,y,s) = w_k(x,t,y,s) + \bar{u}_k(x,t). \tag{4.38}$$

Then $\tilde{w}_k$ satisfies (4.32) *and* (4.33).

(ii) $w_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\partial_s w_k(x,t,y,s) + \partial_t \tilde{w}_{k-2}(x,t,y,s) = \Phi_k(x,t,y,s) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.39}$$

in the classical sense, where we take $\tilde{w}_{-2}$ and $\tilde{w}_{-1}$ by the identically zero functions.

Proof. Since the coefficient $A = A_1$ defined by (4.37) is periodic and uniformly elliptic, we know from Lemma 3.9 that there exists a unique effective coefficient $\bar{A} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{S}^n$ and a unique matrix corrector mapping $X = (\chi_{ij}) : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{S}^n$, such that $\chi_{ij}(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the periodic solution to the following cell problem,

$$\partial_s \chi_{ij} = \operatorname{tr}(A(x,t,y,s)(D_y^2 \chi_{ij} + E_{ij})) - \operatorname{tr}(\bar{A}(x,t)E_{ij}) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.40}$$

that satisfies

$$\chi_{ij}(x,t,0,0) = 0, \tag{4.41}$$

for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and for each $1 \leq i,j \leq n$. Here we denote by E_{ij} the (i,j)-th standard basis matrix for $\mathbb{S}^n$, as introduced in Section 2. In particular, $\bar{A}$ is uniformly

elliptic with the same ellipticity bounds as those of A. Moreover by Proposition 3.16, we know that $\bar{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ and $X \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$ for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \alpha$ (with α being the Hölder exponent in the assumption (2.3)), and

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \bar{A}(x,t) \right| + \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\mu X(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \right] \le C_m, \tag{4.42}$$

for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, where C_m depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, m and K.

For the base case of the induction argument below, we take all of ϕ_0, ϕ_1, $\bar{u}_{-1}$ and $\bar{u}_{-2}$ by the identically zero functions. Let us fix an integer $r \ge 2$ and suppose that we have already found ϕ_k and $\bar{u}_{k-2}$, for $0 \le k \le r-1$, such that we have $\phi_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, and $\bar{u}_{k-2} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ with

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \bar{u}_{k-2}(x,t) \right| + \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \phi_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \right] \le C_{k,m}, \tag{4.43}$$

for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and any integer $m \ge 0$. Then we define $w_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$w_k(x,t,y,s) = \phi_k(x,t,y,s) + \operatorname{tr}(X(x,t,y,s) D_x^2 \bar{u}_{k-2}(x,t)). \tag{4.44}$$

One may notice that w_0 and w_1 are also identically zero, and that w_k is periodic in (y,s) for any $0 \le k \le r-1$. Set $f_r : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &f_r(x,t,y,s) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(A(x,t,y,s)(2D_xD_y w_{r-1}(x,t,y,s) + D_x^2 w_{r-2}(x,t,y,s))) - \partial_t w_{r-2}(x,t,y,s) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=2}^{r} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_l=r \\ i_1,\cdots,i_l \ge 2}} A_l(x,t,y,s)(W_{i_1}(x,t,y,s), \cdots, W_{i_l}(x,t,y,s)), \end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

where we write, for this moment, by W_k the mapping $D_y^2 w_k + (D_xD_y + D_yD_x)w_{k-1} + D_x^2(w_{k-2} + \bar{u}_{k-2})$; we shall see later that this definition is indeed the same with (4.36) due to (4.38). The right hand side of (4.45) only involves $\{\phi_k\}_{k=0}^{r-1}$, $\{\bar{u}_{k-2}\}_{k=0}^{r-1}$ and $\{w_k\}_{k=0}^{r-1}$. Owing to the induction hypothesis (4.43) and the estimate (4.42), we have $W_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, with

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu W_k(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \le C_{k,m}, \tag{4.46}$$

for all $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and each integer $m \ge 0$. Therefore, we have $f_r \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, and

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu f_r(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \le C_{r,m}, \tag{4.47}$$

for all $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and each integer $m \ge 0$.

Then by Lemma 3.9 and Remark 3.10, there exists a unique $\bar{f}_r : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_r : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi_r(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the periodic solution to the following cell problem,

$$\partial_s \phi_r = \operatorname{tr}(A(x,t,y,s) D_y^2 \phi_r) + f_r(x,t,y,s) - \bar{f}_r(x,t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.48}$$

that satisfies

$$\phi_r(x,t,0,0) = 0, \tag{4.49}$$

for each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$. By (2.3) and (4.47), we observe that (4.48) satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3.16. Therefore, we have $\phi_r \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{2,\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$, for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, and $\bar{f}_r \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$, with

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left[\left| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \bar{f}_r(x,t) \right| + \left\| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \phi_r(x,t,\cdot,\cdot) \right\|_{C^{2,\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})} \right] \leq C_{r,m}, \tag{4.50}$$

for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$ and each integer $m \geq 0$.

Next let us consider the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}_{r-2} = \operatorname{tr}(\bar{A}(x,t) D_x^2 \bar{u}_{r-2}) + \bar{f}_r(x,t) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}_{r-2}(x,0) = \bar{g}_{r-2}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{4.51}$$

Then due to (4.50) and (4.42), we obtain that $\bar{u}_{r-2} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ and

$$\sum_{|\mu|+2\nu=m} \left| D_x^\mu \partial_t^\nu \bar{u}_{r-2}(x,t) \right| \leq C_{r,m}, \tag{4.52}$$

for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$. Combining (4.52) with (4.50), we derive (4.43) for $k = r$. Moreover, as we define w_r by (4.44) with $k = r$, then the equation (4.39) follows from (4.40), (4.48) and (4.51).

To this end, the induction principle gives the functions ϕ_k and $\bar{u}_{k-2}$ that satisfy (4.43), (4.48), (4.49) and (4.51), for each integer $k \geq 0$ (with ϕ_0, ϕ_1, $\bar{u}_{-2}$ and $\bar{u}_{-1}$ being identically zero). Defining $\tilde{w}_k$ by (4.38) with w_k being chosen by (4.44), we see that $\tilde{w}_k$ satisfies (4.32). Moreover, the identity (4.33) is proved by combining (4.41), (4.49) and (4.51). This finishes the proof. □

Remark 4.10. Let us mention that $\bar{A}(x,t) = D_p \bar{F}(0,x,t)$ and $X = D_p w(0,x,t,y,s)$, where $\bar{F}$ and w is the effective operator and the corrector satisfying the cell problem (3.26). We leave out the proof regarding this fact to the reader.

Remark 4.11. One may notice from the proof above that ϕ_2 and $\bar{f}_2$ are the identically zero functions. It is worthwhile to mention that the (zeroth order) effective limit $\bar{u}_0$ is given by the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}_0 = \operatorname{tr}(\bar{A}(x,t) D_x^2 \bar{u}_0) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}_0(x,0) = \bar{g}_0(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{4.53}$$

Equipped with Lemma 4.9, we are ready to prove Proposition 4.7.

Proof of Proposition 4.7. The proof is very similar with that of Proposition 4.1. Take $\{\tilde{w}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ constructed in Lemma 4.9 and proceed with the heuristic computation in that proof. Moreover we utilize (4.39), (4.32) and (4.46) to achieve the estimate (4.35), just like we use (4.15), (4.1) and (4.17) to have (4.5). We skip the proof to avoid repeated arguments. □

Let us finish this subsection by proving a generalized version of Proposition 4.7 that can be considered as the counterpart of Proposition 4.6. As mentioned briefly in the comments before Proposition 4.6, we will need such a generalized form when proving Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 4.12. *Assume F verifies* (2.1) - (2.3) *and let $d \geq 0$ and $m \geq 2d$ be integers. Define $F^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} : \mathbb{S}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$\varepsilon^{2d+2} \bar{F}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(P,x,t,y,s) = F\left(\varepsilon^{2d+2}P + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon^k X_{d,k}(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s\right) - F\left(\sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon^k X_{d,k}(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s\right),$$

with a sequence $\{X_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of $\mathbb{S}^n$-valued mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ that are periodic in their third and the fourth arguments and satisfy (4.46). *Also let $\{\bar{g}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfy* (4.2). *Then there exist a sequence $\{\tilde{w}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ that are periodic in both of their third and fourth arguments such that the following are true.*

(i) $\tilde{w}_{d,k} \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]; C^{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}))$, *for any $0 < \hat{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha}$, and the estimate* (4.32) *holds for any integer $m \geq 0$.*

(ii) $\tilde{w}_{d,k}$ *is independent of its third and fourth argument for $k \in \{0,1\}$ and we have* (4.33) *with $\bar{g}_k$ replaced by $\bar{g}_{d,k}$.*

(iii) Define $\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-2d} \varepsilon^k \tilde{w}_{d,k}\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right), \tag{4.54}$$

for each $m \geq 2d$ and each real number $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_m$ solves

$$\partial_t \tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} = \bar{F}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(\varepsilon^2 D^2 \tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_m x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \psi^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T),$$

with some $\psi^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ that verifies

$$\left|\psi^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t,y,s)\right| \leq C_{d,m} \varepsilon^{m-2d-1},$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ and any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. The proof is follows the arguments in the proofs of Proposition 4.7 and Proposition 4.6. We omit the details. □

4.3. **Nonlinear Coupling Effect and the Bootstrap Argument.** So far we have observed how one can construct the correctors that approximate the solution of (1.1) in the region near the initial time layer and, respectively, in the interior of the underlying domain. If the governing operator F were linear in its matrix variable P, we would prove our main theorem, namely Theorem 1.1, by merely repeating Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.7. However, due to the nonlinearity of F, we realize that one has to take care of the "nonlinear coupling effect" near the initial time layer, which makes the iteration argument more involved. This is the reason that we have come up with Proposition 4.6 and Proposition 4.12.

In what follows, we shall fix integers $d \geq 0$ and $m \geq 2d+2$, unless stated otherwise. For notational convenience, let us denote by $\beta_{d,m}$ a positive constant that depends only on n, λ, Λ, d and m, and write by $c_{d,m}$ and $C_{d,m}$ positive constants that are determined only by n, λ, Λ, α, d, m, T and K. We shall also let these constants to vary from one line to another.

Let us begin with our analysis under the setting of Proposition 4.6. With the operator $F^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$, the source term $f^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ and the initial data $g^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ given as in (4.26), (4.27) and respectively (4.28), we consider the following (uniformly parabolic and spatially periodic) Cauchy problem with rapidly oscillating initial data,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} = F^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(D^2 u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}, x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + f^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,0) = g^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(x, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{4.55}$$

Let $\{\tilde{v}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{\bar{g}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be chosen as those in Proposition 4.6 and define $Y_{d+1,k} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{S}^n$ by

$$Y_{d+1,k}(x,t,y,s)(x,t,y,s) = Y_{d,k}(x,t,y,s) + V_{d,k-2d}(x,t,y,s), \tag{4.56}$$

with $V_{d,k-2d}$ being defined by (4.7) for $k \geq 2d$ and by the identically zero mapping for $0 \leq k \leq 2d-1$. Set $\tilde{F}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} : \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{2d+2}\tilde{F}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(P,x,t,y,s) = F\left(\varepsilon^{2d+2}P + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon^k (X_{d,k} + Y_{d+1,k})(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s\right) \\ - F\left(\sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon^k (X_{d,k} + Y_{d+1,k})(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.57}$$

Under this situation, let us consider the following Cauchy problem with non-oscillatory initial data,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} = \tilde{F}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(D^2 \bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}, x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,0) = \bar{g}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{4.58}$$

where $\bar{g}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ is defined by (4.29).

Let $\tilde{v}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ be chosen by (4.29) and we claim that it describes the oscillatory behavior of the viscosity solution $u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ to (4.55) near the initial time layer, up to an error of order ε^{m-2d+1}, and the viscosity solution $\bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ to (4.58) is the non-oscillatory part left from this error correction.

Lemma 4.13. *Let $u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ and $\bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ be the viscosity solutions to* (4.55) *and, respectively,* (4.58)*, and suppose that $\tilde{v}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ is defined by* (4.29)*. Then one has*

$$\left|u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \tilde{v}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t)\right| \leq C_{d,m}\varepsilon^{m-2d+1}, \tag{4.59}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $0 \leq t \leq T$ and, in particular,

$$\left|u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t)\right| \leq C_m\varepsilon^{m-2d+1}, \tag{4.60}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $c_{d,m}\varepsilon^2|\log\varepsilon| \leq t \leq T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. It should be stressed that the operator $F^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ of (4.58) is uniformly elliptic with the same ellipticity bounds as those of F. This property ensures the existence and the uniqueness of the (bounded uniformly continuous) viscosity solution $\bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ to (4.58).

Since the initial data $\bar{g}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ is smooth and the operator $\tilde{F}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ is smooth, concave and uniformly elliptic, we deduce from the regularity theory [W2] of the viscosity

solutions that $\bar{u}^\varepsilon_m$ is also smooth. Let us define $\phi^\varepsilon_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\phi^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t,y,s) = \tilde{F}^\varepsilon_{d,m+2}\left(D^2\bar{u}^\varepsilon_m(x,t),x,t,y,s\right) - \tilde{F}^\varepsilon_{d,m}\left(D^2\bar{u}^\varepsilon_m(x,t),x,t,y,s\right),$$

where we take $\tilde{F}^\varepsilon_{d,m+2}$ as in (4.57), with all of $X_{d,m+1}$, $X_{d,m+2}$, $Y_{d,m+1}$ and $Y_{d,m+2}$ being replaced, for the moment, by the identically zero mappings, and with $V_{d,m-2d+1}$ and $V_{d,m-2d+2}$ being replaced by $(D_xD_y + D_yD_x)v_{d,m-2d} + D^2_x\tilde{v}_{d,m-2d-1}$ and $D^2_x\tilde{v}_{d,m-2d}$ respectively. Then by (2.1) and (4.17), we have

$$\left|\phi^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t,y,s)\right| \le C_{d,m}\varepsilon^{m-2d+1}e^{-\beta_{d,m}s}, \tag{4.61}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ and any $0 < \varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$. Let us remark here that we do not require any estimate for $D^2\bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ to derive (4.61), due to the uniform ellipticity condition (2.1) on F.

Now it follows from (4.58) and (4.30) that $\bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m} + \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\left(\bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m} + \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}\right) = \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2}F\left(\varepsilon^2D^2\left(\bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m} + \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}\right), x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \\ \qquad\qquad + r^\varepsilon_{d,m}\left(x,t,\dfrac{x}{\varepsilon},\dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \left(\bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m} + \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}\right)(x,0) = g^\varepsilon_{d,m}\left(x,\dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{4.62}$$

with $r^\varepsilon_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ being defined by

$$r^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t,y,s) = \psi^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t,y,s) + \phi^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t,y,s).$$

In comparison of (4.62) with (4.55), we deduce from the comparison principle [CIL] for viscosity solutions that

$$\left|u^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t) - \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}(x,t)\right| \le \sup_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n}\int_0^t \left|r^\varepsilon_{d,m}(\xi,\tau,\varepsilon^{-1}\xi,\varepsilon^{-2}\tau)\right| d\tau. \tag{4.63}$$

Now (4.59) follows immediately from (4.63), (4.31) and (4.61). The estimate (4.60) then follows from (4.59) and (4.1) (for $\tilde{v}_{d,k}$). □

The lemma above yields the higher order approximation of $u^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ by $\tilde{v}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ and $\bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$. Notice that the oscillatory behavior of $\bar{u}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ (in the interior) has not yet been analyzed. To study its oscillatory behavior in the interior, we need to construct the higher order interior correctors for (4.58). However, one may notice that the operator $\tilde{F}^\varepsilon_{d,m}$ of (4.58) is no longer periodic in the fast temporal variable due to the presence of $\sum_{k=0}^m \varepsilon^k(Y_{d,k} + V_{d,k-2d})$, which is only periodic in the fast spatial variable. Nevertheless, we observe that the construction of the higher order interior correctors for (4.58) is not affected by the influence of this term, since the influence dissipates exponentially fast as $s = \varepsilon^{-2}t \to \infty$ and becomes negligible as soon as we stay away from the initial time layer (that is, $t \gtrsim \varepsilon^2|\log\varepsilon|$). Therefore, it will suffice to construct the correctors based on Proposition 4.12.

In this direction, we choose the sequence $\{\tilde{w}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ according to Proposition 4.12, and define $X_{d+1,k} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{S}^n$ by

$$X_{d+1,k}(x,t,y,s) = X_{d,k}(x,t,y,s) + W_{d,k-2d}(x,t,y,s), \tag{4.64}$$

with $W_{d,k-2d}$ being selected by (4.36) if $k \geq 2d+2$ and by the identically zero mapping if $0 \leq k \leq 2d+1$. For each $k \geq 2$, let $f^1_{d+1,k}$ and $f^2_{d+1,k}$ be the functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f^1_{d+1,k}(x,t,y,s)\\
&= \sum_{l=2}^{k} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_l=k\\ i_1,\cdots,i_k\geq 1}} \big[B_l(x,t,y,s)((X_{d+1,i_1}+Y_{d+1,i_1})(x,t,y,s),\cdots,(X_{d+1,i_l}+Y_{d+1,i_l})(x,t,y,s))\\
&\qquad\qquad -B_l(x,t,y,s)(X_{d+1,i_1}(x,t,y,s),\cdots,X_{d+1,i_l}(x,t,y,s))\big],
\end{aligned}
$$

and respectively by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f^2_{d+1,k}(x,t,y,s)\\
&= \sum_{l=2}^{k} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{i_1+\cdots+i_l=k\\ i_1,\cdots,i_k\geq 1}} \big[B_l(x,t,y,s)((X_{d,i_1}+Y_{d+1,i_1})(x,t,y,s),\cdots,(X_{d,i_l}+Y_{d+1,i_l})(x,t,y,s))\\
&\qquad\qquad -B_l(x,t,y,s)(X_{d,i_1}(x,t,y,s),\cdots,X_{d,i_l}(x,t,y,s))\big],
\end{aligned}
$$

and then we set $f_{d+1,k}: \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
f_{d+1,k}(x,t,y,s) = f^1_{d+1,k}(x,t,y,s) + f^2_{d+1,k}(x,t,y,s). \tag{4.65}
$$

Let us also set $f_{d+1,k}$, for $k \in \{0,1\}$, by the identically zero functions.

On the other hand, let us choose $g_{d+1,k}: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
g_{d+1,k}(x,y) = \bar{g}_{d,k+2}(x) - \tilde{w}_{d,k+2}(x,0,y,0), \tag{4.66}
$$

for each $k \geq 0$, where the sequence $\{\bar{g}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is chosen by Proposition 4.12.

Lemma 4.14. *Let $\{X_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{Y_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{f_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{g_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be the sequences defined by* (4.64), (4.56), (4.65) *and* (4.66) *respectively, and let $F^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$, $f^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$ and $g^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$ be defined under the rules* (4.26), (4.27) *and* (4.28) *with these sequences. Let $u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$ be the viscosity solution to* (4.55) *with $F^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$, $f^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ and $g^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ being replaced by $F^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$, $f^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$ and $g^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$. Moreover, let $\bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ be the viscosity solution to* (4.58) *and $\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ be defined by* (4.54). *Then one has*

$$
\left|\bar{u}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \varepsilon^2 u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}(x,t)\right| \leq C_{d,m}\varepsilon^{m-2d-1}, \tag{4.67}
$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $0 \leq t \leq T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. It is noteworthy that Proposition 4.12 (ii) implies that $\tilde{w}_{d,k}(x,0,y,0) = \bar{g}_{d,k}(x)$ for $k \in \{0,1\}$. This is why the right hand side of (4.66) begins with $k+2$ but not k. Moreover, utilizing the original assumptions on the sequences $\{X_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{Y_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and the assertions in Proposition 4.6 (i) - (ii) and Proposition 4.12 (i) - (ii), one may also prove that the new sequences $\{X_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{Y_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{f_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{g_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ verify all the assumptions in Proposition 4.6. Thus, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.13, one may observe that

$$
\begin{cases}
\partial_t\left(\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} + \varepsilon^2 u^{\varepsilon}_{1,m}\right) = \tilde{F}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(D^2\left(\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} + \varepsilon^2 u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}\right), x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\\
\qquad\qquad + r^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}\left(x,t,\dfrac{x}{\varepsilon},\dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T),\\
\left(\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} + \varepsilon^2 u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}\right)(x,0) = \bar{g}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n,
\end{cases}
$$

in the viscosity sense, for some $r^{\varepsilon}_{d,m} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\left| r^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t,y,s) \right| \le C_m \varepsilon^{m-2d-1}. \tag{4.68}$$

Thus, the error estimate (4.67) follows from the comparison principle [CIL] for viscosity solutions (see (4.63), for instance) and (4.68). We skip the details in order to avoid repeated arguments. □

Remark 4.15. It is worthwhile to see that $u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ and $u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$ solve the Cauchy problems that belong to the same class, in the sense that the operators, the source terms and the initial data of the both problems satisfy the same assumptions of Proposition 4.1. Now due to the ε^2-factor in front of $u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}$ in the estimate of (4.67) allows us to prove Theorem 1.1 by a bootstrap argument.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Combining Lemma 4.13 with Lemma 4.14, we derive that

$$\left| u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \tilde{v}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \varepsilon^2 u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}(x,t) \right| \le C_{d,m} \varepsilon^{m-2d-1}, \tag{4.69}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $0 \le t \le T$ and, in particular,

$$\left| u^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}(x,t) - \varepsilon^2 u^{\varepsilon}_{d+1,m}(x,t) \right| \le C_{d,m} \varepsilon^{m-2d-1}, \tag{4.70}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $c_m \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon| \le t \le T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$. Meanwhile, we obtain the new sequences $\{X_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{Y_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{f_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{g_{d+1,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ verify all the assumptions in Proposition 4.6, from the sequences $\{X_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{Y_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $\{f_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{g_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$.

Let us take $X_{0,k}$ and $Y_{0,k}$ by the identically zero mappings for all $k \ge 0$. We shall also choose $f_{0,k}$ and $g_{0,k}$ by the identically zero functions for all $k \ge 0$ but $g_{0,0} = g$. Then one may see that the problem (4.55) for $d = 0$ coincides with our base-case problem (1.1). Now we iterate Lemma 4.13 and Lemma 4.14 for $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$-times, from which we obtain the sequences $\{\tilde{v}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{\tilde{w}_{d,k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ for $0 \le d \le \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$ such that the functions $\tilde{v}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ and $\tilde{w}^{\varepsilon}_{d,m}$ defined by (4.29) and, respectively, (4.54) satisfy (4.69) and (4.70). Finally, the estimates (1.2) and (1.3) follow from the triangle inequality and (4.69) and, respectively, (4.70). □

5. Further Observations

This section is devoted to making some further observations on the (higher order) convergence rates for uniformly parabolic Cauchy problems. In Subsection 5.1, we obtain the higher order convergence rate for (1.4). In Subsection 5.2, we achieve the optimal convergence rate for (1.5) under some additional structure condition on the operator F and the initial data g.

5.1. **Non-oscillatory Initial Data and Higher Order Convergence Rate.**

Based on the construction of the higher order correctors, we are able to achieve the higher order convergence rate of the homogenization process of the problem (1.4). The iteration argument is basically the same with that in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The key difference here is that we begin with the higher order error correction in the interior first, not near the initial time layer. This seems to be reasonable, since we do not have any "zeroth order" oscillation near the initial layer in the framework of the problem (1.4).

The construction of the higher order interior correctors for (1.4) is essentially the same with Proposition 4.7, and has already been studied in the authors' previous work [KL] in the framework of elliptic equations.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume that F satisfies* (2.1) - (2.3) *and let $\bar{g} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy* (4.2). *Then there exist a sequence $\{\tilde{w}_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ that are periodic in both of their third and fourth arguments and satisfy Proposition 4.7 (i) - (iii), with* (5.1) *replaced by*

$$\partial_t \tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon = F\left(D^2 \tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon, x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \psi_m^\varepsilon\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T). \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. The main difference of the proof here from that of Proposition 4.7 is that the function $\bar{u}_0$ in Lemma 4.9 is chosen by the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}_0 = \bar{F}(D_x^2 \bar{u}_0, x, t) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}_0(x,0) = \bar{g}_0(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

instead of (4.53). It should be stressed that the matrix corrector X and the effective coefficient $\bar{A}$ are chosen to be the same as those in Remark 4.10. We omit the rest of the proof to avoid redundant arguments. □

Equipped with Proposition 5.1 together with Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.7, we are ready to state and prove the higher order convergence rate regarding the homogenization problem of (1.4).

Proposition 5.2. *Assume F and g verify* (2.1) - (2.3) *and* (4.2) *respectively. Let $\bar{u}^\varepsilon$ be the viscosity solution to* (1.4) *for $\varepsilon > 0$. Then for each integer $d \geq 0$, there exist $\tilde{v}_{d,k} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, which is periodic in its third argument, and $\tilde{w}_{d,k} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, which is periodic in its third and fourth arguments, for each $k \geq 0$, such that one has*

$$\left| \bar{u}^\varepsilon(x,t) - \sum_{d=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{m-2d} \varepsilon^{k+2d} \left(\tilde{v}_{d,k}\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \tilde{w}_{d,k}\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right)\right| \leq C_m \varepsilon^{m-1},$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $0 \leq t \leq T$, and, in particular,

$$\left| \bar{u}^\varepsilon(x,t) - \sum_{d=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{m-2d} \varepsilon^{k+2d} \tilde{w}_{d,k}\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right| \leq C_m \varepsilon^{m-1},$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $c_m \varepsilon^2 |\log \varepsilon| \leq t \leq T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $m \geq 2$, where $c_m > 0$ and $C_m > 0$ depend only on n, λ, Λ, α, m, T and K.

Proof. Let us fix $m \geq 2$. Due to Proposition 5.1, we derive that

$$\left| \bar{u}^\varepsilon(x,t) - \tilde{w}_m^\varepsilon(x,t) - \varepsilon^2 u_{0,m}^\varepsilon \right| \leq C_m \varepsilon^{m-1},$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, where $C_m > 0$ depends only on n, λ, Λ, α, m, T and K, with $u_{0,m}^\varepsilon$ being the viscosity solution to to (4.55) for $d = 0$, $X_{0,k} = W_k$, $Y_{0,k} = 0$, and $f_{0,m}^\varepsilon = 0$. Recall from (4.36) the definition of W_k. Thus, $u_{0,m}^\varepsilon$ falls under the regime of Lemma 4.13, and hence we may proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 and achieve the desired estimates. This finishes the proof. □

5.2. **Oscillatory Initial Data and Optimal Convergence Rate.** Let us begin with a short overview the homogenization process of the problem (1.5), which can be found in [AB] and [M1]. First we make an additional assumption on F that there is $F_* : \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ for which

$$\varepsilon^2 F\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}P, x, t, y, s\right) \to F_*(P, x, t, y, s) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{5.2}$$

locally uniformly for all $(P, x, t, y, s) \in (\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Here F_* is called the recession operator (corresponding to F). It is clear from its definition that F_* also satisfies the conditions (2.1) - (2.2).

Following Lemma 3.1 and the comments above it, we obtain a (unique) function $v : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ that is periodic in its third argument and that $v(x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the spatially periodic solution to

$$\begin{cases} v_s = F_*(D_y^2 v, x, t, y, s) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty), \\ v(x,t,y,0) = g(y,x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

for each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]$, and a function $\bar{v} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\bar{v}(x,t) = \lim_{s\to\infty} v(x,t,0,s). \tag{5.4}$$

Let us define $\tilde{v} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{g} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{v}(x,t,y,s) = v(x,t,y,s) - \bar{v}(x,t) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{g}(x) = \bar{v}(x,0),$$

as in (4.14).

On the other hand, let $\bar{F} : \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ and $w : \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by (3.34) and, respectively, (3.35). For the reader's convenience, let us repeat that $\bar{F}(P,x,t)$ is the unique real number such that $w(P,x,t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the periodic solution to

$$w_s = F(D_y^2 w + P, x, t, y, s) - \bar{F}(P,x,t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R},$$

and also satisfies

$$w(P,x,t,0,0) = 0.$$

Under these circumstances, the ε-problem (1.5) is homogenized to the following effective problem

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t = \bar{F}(D^2\bar{u}, x, t) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}(x,0) = \bar{g}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

according to [AB] and [M1], in the sense that the viscosity solution u^ε of (1.5) converges to the viscosity solution $\bar{u}$ of (5.5) locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T)$.

The following proposition gives the optimal rate of $u^\varepsilon \to \bar{u}$ under some additional assumptions.

Proposition 5.3. *Assume F and g verify* (2.1) - (2.3) *and* (2.5) - (2.6). *Suppose that F_* satisfies, with some $0 \le \delta < 1$,*

$$|F(P,x,t,y,s) - F_*(P,x,t,y,s)| \le K\|P\|^\delta, \tag{5.6}$$

for all $(P,x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, and that v and $\bar{v}$ satisfy the conclusion of Proposition 3.7. Under these circumstances, let u^ε and $\bar{u}$ be the viscosity solutions to (1.5)

and, respectively, (5.5). *Then there are positive constants c and C, depending only on n, λ, Λ, α, δ and K, such that*

$$|u^\varepsilon(x,t) - \bar{u}(x,t)| \le C\varepsilon^{\min(1,2-2\delta)}, \tag{5.7}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $c\varepsilon^2|\log\varepsilon| \le t \le T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$.

Remark 5.4. The inequality (5.6) implies that

$$\left|\varepsilon^2 F\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}P, x, t, y, s\right) - F_*(P, x, t, y, s)\right| \le K\varepsilon^{2-2\delta}\,\|P\|^\delta\,, \tag{5.8}$$

for any $(P, x, t, y, s) \in \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. In comparison of (5.8) with (5.7), we realize that the rate of $u^\varepsilon \to \bar{u}$ depends sensitively on the rate of (5.2).

Remark 5.5. The second additional assumption that v and $\bar{v}$ satisfy the assertion of Proposition 3.7 has been made because this assumption fails to hold for general F_*. The main reason is that nonlinear F_* is Lipschitz continuous (in the matrix variable P) at best, which prevents us from having Proposition 3.7. We shall provide some concrete example later in this regard.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Throughout this proof, we will write by c and C positive constants depending at most on n, λ, Λ, α, δ and K, and let them vary from one line to another.

Define $\tilde{v}^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{v}^\varepsilon(x,t) = \tilde{v}\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right).$$

Since v and $\bar{v}$ is assumed to satisfy (3.25) for all $m \ge 0$, we observe that $\tilde{v}^\varepsilon$ is a (classical solution) to

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}^\varepsilon_t = F\left(D^2\tilde{v}^\varepsilon, x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \psi^\varepsilon\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \tilde{v}^\varepsilon(x,0) = g\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) - \bar{g}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

with $\psi^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ being defined by

$$\psi^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s) = F_*(\varepsilon^{-2}V_0(x,y,s), x, t, y, s) - F\left(\sum_{k=0}^{2}\varepsilon^{k-2}V_k(x,y,s), x, t, y, s\right),$$

where we write by V_0, V_1 and V_2 the $\mathbb{S}^n$-valued mappings $D_y^2\tilde{v}$, $(D_xD_y + D_yD_x)\tilde{v}$ and, respectively, $D_x^2\tilde{v}$.

One may notice that (3.25) implies (4.17) for V_0, V_1 and V_2. Thus, utilizing (5.6), we observe that

$$\left|F_*(\varepsilon^{-2}V_0(x,y,s), x, t, y, s) - F(\varepsilon^{-2}V_0(x,y,s), x, t, y, s)\right| \le C\varepsilon^{-2\delta}e^{-\delta\beta s}, \tag{5.9}$$

for any $(x,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ and any $0 < \varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, we have from (2.1) that

$$\left|F(\varepsilon^{-2}V_0(x,y,s), x, t, y, s) - F\left(\sum_{k=0}^{2}\varepsilon^{k-2}V_k(x,y,s), x, t, y, s\right)\right| \le C\varepsilon^{-1}e^{-\beta s}, \tag{5.10}$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ and any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Combining (5.9) with (5.10), we arrive at

$$\left|\psi^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s)\right| \leq C\varepsilon^{-2\delta}e^{-\delta\beta s},$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty)$ and any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Thus, arguing analogously as in the proof of Lemma 4.13, we deduce that

$$|u^\varepsilon(x,t) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(x,t)| \leq C\varepsilon^{2-2\delta}, \tag{5.11}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $c\varepsilon^2|\log\varepsilon| \leq t \leq T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, where $\bar{u}^\varepsilon$ is the (viscosity) solution to

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}^\varepsilon_t = \tilde{F}^\varepsilon\left(D^2\bar{u}^\varepsilon x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \bar{u}^\varepsilon(x,0) = \bar{g}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

with $\tilde{F}^\varepsilon : \mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ being defined by

$$\tilde{F}^\varepsilon(P,x,t,y,s) = F(P + \varepsilon^{-2}V_0(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s) - F(\varepsilon^{-2}V_0(x,t,y,s), x, t, y, s).$$

On the other hand, we know that Proposition 3.16 is true under the assumptions (2.1) - (2.3) on F. Hence, it follows from the estimate (3.42) and the assumption (3.25), which holds also for $\bar{g}$, that the solution $\bar{u}$ to (5.5) satisfies $\bar{u} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T])$ with the estimate (4.52). Now we define $\tilde{w} : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{w}(x,t,y,s) = w(D_x^2\bar{u}(x,t), x, t, y, s).$$

Then $\tilde{w}$ satisfies (4.32) for all $m \geq 0$. Therefore, arguing as above, we observe that the function $\tilde{w}^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$\tilde{w}^\varepsilon(x,t) = \bar{u}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2\tilde{w}\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right),$$

solves

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{w}^\varepsilon_t = F\left(D^2\tilde{w}^\varepsilon, x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \psi^\varepsilon\left(x, t, \dfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \dfrac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T), \\ \tilde{w}^\varepsilon(x,0) = \bar{g}(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

for some $\psi^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\left|\psi^\varepsilon(x,t,y,s)\right| \leq C\varepsilon,$$

for any $(x,t,y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ and any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Now we may proceed as in the proof of Lemma 4.14 and deduce that

$$\left|\bar{u}^\varepsilon(x,t) - \tilde{w}^\varepsilon\left(x, t, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}\right) - \varepsilon^2 u_1^\varepsilon(x,t)\right| \leq C\varepsilon, \tag{5.12}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $0 \leq t \leq T$, provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, where u_1^ε is the viscosity solution to a uniformly parabolic Cauchy problem that belongs to the same class of (4.55), in the sense of uniform ellipticity of the operator, that an exponential decay estimate for the source term is available and that the initial data is of order $1 = \varepsilon^0$. Here we do not specify the form of this Cauchy problem, since the argument becomes repetitive otherwise. It is only important to observe that $|u_1^\varepsilon(x,t)| \leq C$ for

all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $0 \le t \le T$ and all $0 < \varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$. Finally, the error estimate (5.7) can be deduced by combining (5.11) and (5.12). □

Let us finish this subsection with an example that reveals that the assumptions of Proposition 5.3 are satisfied for certain F and g.

Example 5.6. Let F_* be independent of (x, t, y, s) and satisfy $F_*(P) < -F_*(-P)$ for any nonzero matrix $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$. For instance, one may take F_* by Pucci's minimal operator for the lower ellipticity bound $\lambda' > \lambda$ and the upper ellipticity bound $\Lambda' < \Lambda$. On the other hand, let g be given by $g(x, y) = \psi(x)\phi(y)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, with ϕ being a smooth periodic function and ψ being a smooth bounded function.

Let us write by $F_-(P)$ and $F_+(P)$ the functionals $F_*(P)$ and, respectively, $-F_*(-P)$, and consider the spatially periodic Cauchy problem,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s v_\pm = F_\pm(D_y^2 v_\pm) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty), \\ v_\pm(y, 0) = \phi(y) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

According to Lemma 3.1, there are unique real numbers γ_+ and γ_- such that $\gamma_\pm = \lim_{s\to\infty} v_\pm(0, s)$. Notice that $v_\pm \in C^{2,\alpha}$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$ depending only on n, λ and Λ, owing to the convexity of F_+ and the concavity of F_-.

Let us observe that $\gamma_+ > \gamma_-$. First it follows from the comparison principle that $v_+ > v_-$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$, which implies $\gamma_+ \ge \gamma_-$. Moreover, since $F_+(P) > F_-(P)$ for any nonzero $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$, the function $w = v_+ - v_-$ solves

$$\partial_s(v_+ - v_-) \ge \operatorname{tr}(A(y, s)D_y^2(v_+ - v_-)) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty),$$

where A is the linearized coefficient associated with F_+. This implies that the function $W(s) = \min_{\mathbb{R}^n}(v_+(\cdot, s) - v_-(\cdot, s))$ is non-decreasing for $s > 0$, whence we have $\gamma_+ > \gamma_-$.

Now let v be the solution to (5.3). Then the uniqueness of v implies that $v(x, y, s) = \psi(x)v_-(y, s)$ if $\psi(x) \ge 0$ and $v(x, y, s) = \psi(x)v_+(y, s)$ if $\psi(x) \le 0$. This also implies that the function $\bar{v}$ defined by (5.4) satisfies $\bar{v}(x) = \gamma_+\psi(x)$ if $\psi(x) \ge 0$ and $\bar{v}(x) = \gamma_-\psi(x)$ if $\psi(x) \le 0$.

This implies that if ψ changes sign at some point, then v and $\bar{v}$ are not even differentiable at that point. On the other hand, we have v and $\bar{v}$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 3.7, provided that ψ is either uniformly positive or uniformly negative.

References

[AA] Allaire, G.; Amar, M. *Boundary layer tails in periodic homogenization*. ESAIM Control, Optim. Calc. Var. **4** (1999), 209-243.

[AB] Alvarez, O.; Bardi, M. *Singular perturbations of nonlinear degenerate parabolic PDEs: a general convergence result*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **170**(1) (2003), 17-61.

[ABM] Alvarez, O.; Bardi, M.; Marchi, C. *Multiscale problems and homogenization for second-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations*. J. Differ. Equ. **243**(2) (2007), 329-387.

[ABDW] Andrianov, I.V.; Bolshakov, V.I.; Danishevs'kyy, V.V.; Weichert, D. *Higher order asymptotic homogenization and wave propagation in periodic composite materials*. Proc. Roy. Soc. A **464**(2093) (2008), 1181-1201.

[CM] Camili, F.; Marchi, C. *Continuous dependence estimates and homogenization of quasi-monotone systems of fully nonlinear second order parabolic equations*. Nonlinear Anal. **75**(13) (2012), 5103-5118.

[CE] Cherendnichenko, K.D.; Evans, J.A. *Full two-scale asymptotic expansion and higher-order constitute laws in the homogenization of the system of quasi-static Maxwell equations*. Multiscale Model. Simul. **14**(4) (2016), 1513-1539.

[CS] Cherednichenko, K.D.; Smyshlyaev, V.P. *On full two-scale expansion of the solutions of nonlinear periodic rapidly oscillating problems and higher-order homogenised variational problems*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **174**(3) (2004), 385-442.

[CIL] Crandall, M.G.; Ishii, H.; Lions, P.-L. *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **27**(1) (1992), 1-67.

[E1] Evans, L.C. *The perturbed test function method for viscosity solutions of nonlinear P.D.E.* Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **111** (1989), 359-375.

[E2] Evans, L.C. *Periodic homogenisation of certain fully nonlinear partial differential equations*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **120** (1992), 245-265.

[HO] Hui, T.; Oskay, C. *A high order homogenization model for transient dynamics of heterogeneous media including micro-inertia effects*. Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **273** (2014), 181-203.

[Ich] Ichihara, N. *A stochastic representation for fully nonlinear PDEs and its application to homogenization*. J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **12**(3) (2005), 467-492.

[Ish] Ishii, H. *Homogenization of the Cauchy problem for Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Stochastic Analysis, Control, Optimization and Applications, pp. 305-324, Systems Control Found. Appl., Birkhäuser Boston (1999).

[JK] Jakobsen, E.R.; Karlsen, K.H. *Continuous dependence estimates for viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations*. J. Differ. Equ. **183**(2) (2002), 497-525.

[KMP] Kamotski, Matthies, Smyshlyaev, *Exponential homogenization of linear second order elliptic PDEs with periodic coefficients*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. **38**(5) (2007), 1565-1587.

[KL] Kim, S.; Lee, K.-A. *Higher order convergence rates in theory of homogenization I: equations of non-divergence form*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **219**(3) (2016), 1273-1304.

[L] Lin, J. *On the stochastic homogenization of fully nonlinear uniformly parabolic equations in stationary ergodic spatio-temporal media*. J. Differ. Equ. **258**(3) (2015), 796-845.

[LS] Lin, J.; Smart, C. *Algebraic error estimates for the stochastic homogenization of uniformly parabolic equations*. Anal. PDE **8**(6) (2015), 1497-1539.

[M1] Marchi, C. *Homogenization for fully nonlinear parabolic equations*. Nonlinear Anal. **60** (2005), 411-428.

[M2] Marchi, C. *Continuous dependence estimates for the ergodic problem of Bellman-Isaacs operators via the parabolic Cauchy problem*. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **18**(4) (2012), 954-968.

[MS] Mel'nik, T.A.; Sivak, O.A. *Asymptotic approximations for solutions to quasilinear and linear parabolic problems with different perturbed boundary conditions in perforated domains*. J. Math. Sci. **177**(1) (2011), 50-70.

[W1] Wang, L. *On the regularity theory of fully nonlinear parabolic equations: I*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **45**(1) (1992), 27-76.

[W2] Wang, L. *On the regularity theory of fully nonlinear parabolic equations: II*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **45**(2) (1992), 141-178.

[W3] Wang, L. *On the regularity theory of fully nonlinear parabolic equations: III*. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **45**(3) (1992), 255-262.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Korea
E-mail address: sunghan290@snu.ac.kr

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Korea & Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 02455, Korea
E-mail address: kiahm@snu.ac.kr